

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

THE books which have been published by the Student Christian Movement Press in the series known as 'Studies in Biblical Theology' have become familiar to all students of theology, and are readily recognized by their slim build and the light grey colour of their binding. It is now ten years since the venture started under the joint editorship of Professors H. H. Rowley, T. W. Manson, F. V. Filson, and G. E. Wright. Since the death of T. W. Manson, an admirable successor to him has been found in Professor C. F. D. Moule. Already twenty-eight books have appeared in the series, and many of them have been works of real distinction. The latest is *Lordship and Discipleship*, by Eduard SCHWEIZER, Professor of New Testament at Zürich.¹ Originally this was published in German in 1955 under the title 'Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolgern' but the author himself, before making it available in English, subjected it to considerable revision and rearrangement. The German title (which means 'the humiliation and exaltation of Jesus and His followers') does in fact give a better clue to the contents than the English title.

The first chapter examines the words of Jesus about the meaning of discipleship and summarizes the implications of them as follows: (1) Jesus called men to follow Him and their obedience or disobedience to His call was a fact of decisive significance in their lives. (2) Obedience to His call involved an utterly new beginning. (3) Following Jesus meant 'togetherness with Him, and service to Him'. (4) It entailed giving up all other ties, to boat and tax office, to father and mother, in short, to one's own life, to oneself. (5) As Jesus' own way, by divine necessity, led to rejection, suffering and death, and only so to glory, so also does the way of those who follow Him.

This last sentence summarizes the theme of the whole book. 'The servant must be as his Lord',

¹ 10s. 6d. net.

attaining to triumph only through readiness to bear suffering and distress.

To this analysis of discipleship Professor SCHWEIZER adds the comment: 'Only the disciple can know who Jesus really is. . . . No formula merely taught and learned by a disciple can adequately describe this. One cannot know who Jesus is until one shares His way with Him. This is the meaning of the "Messianic secret", this is the explanation of His reserve in connexion with the title "Christ".'

The author then examines the writings of Judaism to discover how far this association of rejection and humiliation with ultimate exaltation may have been foreshadowed there. He finds there much evidence for a belief among Jewish writers in a 'Suffering and Exalted Righteous One'. Nowhere is this clearer than in the Wisdom of Solomon. Many of its words sound almost like anticipations of what befell Jesus: 'Let us oppose the poor righteous man', say the wicked; 'the very sight of Him is a nuisance to us. . . . He boasts that God is His Father. . . . Let us condemn Him to a dishonorable death; for according to His word He will be protected' (Wisdom 2). But ultimately shall 'the righteous man stand in great boldness before the face of such as have afflicted him' . . . who shall say: 'Now is he numbered among the children of God, and his lot is among the saints'.

Professor SCHWEIZER summarizes the teaching of Judaism on this theme in these words: 'Judaism frequently speaks of the righteous one who humbles himself or voluntarily accepts humiliation by suffering and death in obedience to God. Suffering in particular is very valuable as atonement for one's own sins or vicarious atonement for other people's. As a reward the righteous one is exalted by God, secretly already on earth, but especially in the world to come, where he finds his seat reserved for him in heaven, the throne of

glory, and there acts as a judge and executioner. This exaltation can also be pictured physically as an assumption to heaven, as an ascension to heaven.'

It is then shown how this Judaistic theme is used in the New Testament in relation to Jesus and indeed appears there as a recurring motif. 'Already in the Synoptic Gospels much must remain unclear until one recognizes how naturally Jesus' life was at first regarded as the fate of the Righteous One in Israel. Only so do we understand that the inevitableness of suffering is simply stated without any attempt at explanation, and that the exaltation follows equally as a matter of course.' 'His life was the life of the Righteous, the Obedient One whose part God had now taken. His death therefore was no failure but the fulfilment of God's will. And His resurrection was the divine exaltation of the Righteous One.' Only at a later stage did a deeper note creep into the Church's attitude to His death, and suggestions about its atoning effectiveness come to be made, and interpretations put forward in terms of the 'familiar sacrificial worship'.

Another chapter deals with the thought of Jesus in the New Testament as the One who represents the True Israel. To Him are ascribed names which in the Old Testament had been used for the whole people of Israel—'Son of God', 'Son of Man', 'the True Vine', 'the Last Adam'. And in this respect also the disciples are as their Lord, for they too are the New Israel, the new people of God. 'Fellowship with Christ can apparently take no other form than that Christ takes those who follow Him in His way.'

Later chapters expound the exaltation of Jesus to divine glory, His resurrection and ascension, and His place at the right hand of God. Considerable space is given to the exposition of what are regarded as primitive credal survivals, embedded in the Epistles. Among these are included Ph 2¹⁻¹¹ and 1 Ti 3¹⁶, and both these passages are discussed with admirable understanding.

There is a further chapter on Discipleship after Easter. The description of discipleship as 'following Jesus' is hardly applicable at this stage, and, indeed, is not normally used in the New Testament of this later period of discipleship. But though the word 'follow' tends to be dropped, the meaning of discipleship does not change. It still represents a decisive step into a new kind of life, lived in company with Christ, and loyalty to Him

supersedes all other ties. With Him we must be ready to take the way of suffering where obedience leads us to it. But beyond the suffering and the humiliation of death, triumph and fullness of life await the disciple no less than the Lord he follows. 'While originally discipleship, following Jesus, meant the way of the disciple on earth, leading to self-denial and suffering, perhaps indeed to death, but which had received the divine promise of exaltation to the true life; so now a new view can be distinguished in which the way to divine glory becomes the decisive thing for which the earthly way is merely a pre-condition.' 'An all-embracing "being where He is" has been granted to whosoever follows Him.'

This is not an easy book to read. The English phrasing is not always clear, and distinctions made are sometimes over-subtle, but the main theme is plain and convincing. English readers will be grateful to have this book by a distinguished German scholar available in their own language.

It is a good thing every now and then to be confronted with a problem at its most acute, a solution at its highest, and a challenge at its most imperative; and it is with just such a confrontation that Dr. Alan WALKER faces us in *A New Mind for a New Age*.¹

Dr. WALKER is open-eyed to the difficulties and the problems which face us in our present situation. 'Dispossessed economic man is awakened. He stands defiant before economic inequalities. It is precisely that fact which gives Communism its attraction, and many do not see beyond its promises to the manacles it holds behind its back.' 'Colonial man is on his feet. Every form of colonialism and imperialism is finished.' 'Most fundamental of all, 'Coloured man is demanding equality'. All this is happening in an age which has certain unique characteristics. 'The general characteristic of this new age is the rising prosperity of the technologically advanced nations of the earth, and the age of plenty which at least theoretically opens out before all mankind.' This very fact of potential plenty for all makes all the more challenging the saying of Dr. H. E. Fosdick: 'The conviction that the basic test of any society is what happens to the underdog has haunted my preaching'. Add to all this that this is the age of mass society. 'When nine million British television sets are all tuned into the one television programme and perhaps twenty-five

¹ Epworth Press; 10s. 6d. net.

million people think, laugh, feel together, it can be said that mass society has arrived.'

Into this pattern there have to be fitted certain other very significant facts. In a very curious sense this is an age in which the sense of personal responsibility is lost. It is a very significant fact that 'possibly only one per cent. of the more than a million people engaged in producing the first atom bomb knew of the project in which they were engaged'. In addition to that kind of irresponsibility there enters into life a kind of deliberate irresponsibility. Dr. Walker quotes a letter from an advertisement in an American newspaper. The letter was from a satisfied customer who had bought a motor boat, and it ran: 'I have found a new philosophy of living. I am not any more going to worry about wars and depressions and atom bombs. I'm going to have a lot of fun.' This irresponsibility can invade the Church. 'Many of the sessions which are given merely to the singing of hymns are sheer escapism. Too many sermons belong to the "peace of mind cult" and others point away to the "Second Coming of Christ".' 'Both types can be largely irresponsible, expressing a retreat from life rather than a call to involvement in it.'

There are still further things on the debit side. There is the high divorce rate. 'It is almost unbelievable now to remember that in all the years from the Reformation until 1836 there were fewer than four hundred divorces in England'. 'Sex morals and civilization', said Canon Raven, 'rise and fall together'. That is why 'a Christian resistance movement against easy divorce is so necessary'.

One of the supreme human problems of a mass society is loneliness. The modern city is a lonely place. Bishop Lesslie Newbigin has said: 'Modern cities have made people like grains of sand fretted by water from an ancient block of sandstone, ceaselessly churned around in the whirlpool of the metropolis as anonymous, replaceable units'. Dr. WALKER tells of a lonely old woman in the city of Sydney. She was ill, and had neither friend nor kith nor kin. She said quietly: 'I'm not afraid of dying, but I'm afraid of living till I die'. There was a fellowship when society consisted of the smaller unit, but now there has come

a process of 'detribalization', so that people belong to nothing and to nowhere.

Many people look for salvation in science. Dr. WALKER has four valuable principles to enunciate about science. (1) Science and religion both declare the glory of God. (2) Science is part of God's way of meeting human need. (3) Science demands religion, for it can as easily destroy the world as save it. (4) There are areas of human need where there is only one answer—God. 'On these levels of human experience, science is helpless.'

The problem is there, and so is the challenge. Dr. WALKER summons the Christian to take his full share in the life of the world, in politics, local politics, trade unionism, for only thus can an industrial civilization be Christianized. He calls on the Church to become the one essential place of fellowship and community in a mass world where men and women are lonely and 'detribalized'. He quotes the guiding sentence which the 'Mission to Paris' taught its worker priests: 'Do not try to convert. Love—you are placed beside your brother for that'.

Dr. WALKER just as vividly presents the solution—and the solution is Jesus Christ. He tells how he and his family saw in Bethlehem the place where Jesus is said to have been born, and how his little son just seven years old, prayed that evening: 'O God, thank you for showing us where Jesus was born and help us always to remember'. He quotes a story about Robert Louis Stevenson: 'Robert Louis Stevenson, as a boy, stood one night at dusk with his nose pressed against a window-pane looking out into the gathering darkness. His nurse called him to supper. But still he stood. He was watching, fascinated, an old-fashioned lamp-lighter going from light to light in the street. "Look, look", the boy cried to the nurse. "Look, there's a man out there punching holes in the darkness".' And that is precisely what Jesus Christ can do to the darkness of the world.

Dr. WALKER has given us an honest and a gallant book in which the problems are bravely stated, but in which the solution is also vividly held up for all to see—and the solution is not only a solution, it is also a challenge.

71 (1959/60)

Modern Issues in Biblical Studies

History and the Patriarchs

BY PROFESSOR G. ERNEST WRIGHT, HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

ONE of the remarkable results of archaeological research during the period between the two Wars was the sudden emergence of the Patriarchal Age of Biblical History as one which could be fitted within an actually discernible period in the history of Western Asia. Or at least so it appeared to a number of scholars, who produced a considerable literature on the subject.¹ To W. F. Albright, furthermore, this discovery was of particular significance over against that literary critical reconstruction of Israel's history associated with the name of Julius Wellhausen.²

During the latter part of the nineteenth and the first part of the twentieth centuries there were few data from external sources which could be used to test the early Biblical traditions. It was believed possible, however, to use the documentary sources for the reconstruction of Israel's history by assuming that the ideas and ideals contained in them were reflections of the period in which the traditions were put into writing. Concerning the period of the patriarchs little could be said from the traditions themselves, simply because the stories have been adapted for the religious purposes of the later Israelite community. It may be added that the same essential attitude toward the minimal historical value of the patriarchal traditions is continued to-day among the form-critical and traditio-historical scholars who stand in the Wellhausen succession.³

¹ For example, W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* [1st ed., Baltimore, 1940 and ff.], ch. 4; R. de Vaux, 'Les patriarches Hébreux et les découvertes Modernes', in *Revue Biblique*, liii. [1946] 321-348; lv. [1948] 321-347; lvi. [1949] 5-36; H. H. Rowley, 'Recent Discovery and the Patriarchal Age', in *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays* [London, 1952], 271-305; G. Ernest Wright, *Biblical Archaeology* [London, 1957], ch. 3, and the references cited by these sources.

² See Albright, *ib.*; *The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible* [New York, 1932 ff.], ch. 3; and 'The Ancient Near East and the Religion of Israel', in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, lix. [1940] 85-112.

³ See below; and cf. G. von Rad, *Das Erste Buch Mose* [ATD; Göttingen, 1952], 22-33. Nothing is said

For Albright and for those influenced by his radical empiricism in historical matters it is precisely this negativism which archaeology has now thrust aside. Literary-critical and form-critical work can tell us much about the transmission, refraction and final editing of traditions, information of vital importance for Biblical study. In themselves, however, such internal methodologies can never really assess the historical in the traditional. External sources of information are needed, and these archaeology, it is felt, has provided in sufficient amount to make fresh and positive hypotheses possible.

In other words, the 'literary-critical school' believed it possible to step immediately from the dating of documentary sources into history, not the patriarchal history itself but Israelite history between the ninth and fifth centuries B.C. If this in some measure has been shown to be wrong, are we now to go to the opposite extreme and assert that archaeology has proved the critics wrong and that again we can with confidence step directly from the pages of Genesis into the arena of history at this time in the second millennium B.C. ?⁴

Gerhard von Rad has summarized the new perspectives provided by Form-Criticism somewhat as follows in his *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, i [Munich, 1957, pp. 13-15]: Behind the Hexateuch there exists, not the actual course of events, but simply earlier traditions, each with its own conceptions which must be studied for themselves. Instead of asking what is historical, one must ask

in this brief paper about current Scandinavian work on the Old Testament because, as far as I am aware their history-of-tradition work has not led them to an interest in history itself. For a vivid example, see E. Nielsen's *Shechem* [Copenhagen, 1955], a very learned work which actually tells us very little about the city's history.

⁴ It has not infrequently been assumed that this is what is being claimed, though the assumption is largely based upon popularizations like that of Werner Keller, *The Bible as History: Archaeology Confirms the Book of Books* [London, 1956].

of each tradition or fragment thereof, from what circle does it come and what did the members of that circle think it meant? The saga of early Israel are composed of many items, each with its own history but arranged around certain great experiences which form a canonical framework for the whole. This framework is not derived from historical experience, but from cultic worship. The initial question, we therefore infer, cannot be about history, nor even about theology and history, but about *cultic memory and cultic celebration*.

A comparable situation in New Testament study destroyed the older quest for the historical Jesus. Is the search for the historical behind the early Israelite traditions also destroyed? And in any event is this search for the historical really desirable in Biblical study, or is it a search for a will-of-the-wisp which is not theologically significant in any event? If the Bible is first and foremost a *heilsgeschichte*, is it not foolhardy to attempt to reduce it to the plane of secular history? Is historical criticism to be the measure of revelation and its validation? These are rather basic questions, and they stand at the very centre of Old Testament study to-day.

The disciplines of Biblical history and archaeology have been developed largely in a humanistic atmosphere, and one of the axioms within that atmosphere has been the assumption that anything learned about ancient times is an automatic good which needs no justification. Many of those who have been attracted to the *heilsgeschichte*-aspects of modern Biblical theology have for the first time thrown the Biblical archaeologist on the defensive with questions as to the relevance of his work and as to the nature of the history with which he understands himself to be concerned. Yet to this writer any Biblical interpreter who loves theology, but not in equal measure the 'flesh and bones' of history, is certain to fail in his interpretative effort. Various modern forms of gnosticism or docetism can indeed hide behind the revival of Biblical theology. Biblical *heilsgeschichte* is a celebration of events which Biblical man thought really happened and which he interpreted as the mighty work of the God of human life and history, and as well sovereign Lord of all creation. Is it not a matter of considerable importance to theology for the Biblical scholar to assert that in Scripture we are dealing, not with real history understood by faith, but instead with cultic legends elaborated and transmitted through liturgy? Can this be said to represent the assured results of present research? Surely the investigation of the subject is by no means irrelevant to faith.

This much we do know that the more details we have learned about ancient life and times during the last century, the better we have come to

exegete the Bible and to comprehend the significance of its testimony. At the same time, we must be on guard against the implication that the purpose of archaeological and historical investigation is to measure and to authenticate the 'new reality' which the Scriptures reveal. The historical search is only *one* of several branches of Biblical research, and it is a purely *descriptive* investigation. It provides basic data needed to assess the nature of the Biblical testimony and to understand the various ways God used to reveal Himself. It obviously cannot confine truth to its own dimensions, but the 'truth' that it is able to discover is certainly of primary significance to those who would seek to understand the manner in which God has chosen to be God in our midst.

Following von Rad's formulation of the cultic issue we would say that central to the patriarchal stories are the kerygmatic themes of election and promise, and that the individual episodes in the life of Abraham are subsumed within them. These themes are surely derived from religious teaching in a later community which also used them in public confession. The patriarchal stories are therefore cultic in the sense that their form and intent as they come to us is to glorify God and to expound His work in the creation of a 'new thing', a people of God. In analyzing the cultic theme of promise, however, von Rad makes certain *historical* statements. He believes that the promise of the land (Gn 12⁷) and of becoming a great people (v. 2) may well stem from the patriarchal period, while the promise, 'in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed' (v. 3), probably derives from the theological particularity of the Yahwist writer in the tenth century. Yet von Rad is able to offer no proof for these historical conclusions; they are merely hypotheses which appear reasonable and are then taken up into the historical understanding of the Yahwist.¹

What is the background of the individual fragments of patriarchal tradition? The Joseph story is a fairly coherent and lengthy composition which surely was polished while still in oral form, but otherwise we are faced with episodes, each of which must have had its own history of transmission. Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac (ch. 22), for example, is concerned in its present form to portray Abraham's faithful obedience as the true response which God desires. Yet at an earlier stage it must once have been concerned with the abolition of child sacrifice. Gunkel, however, by textual emendation makes the *historical* conclusion that the story was once a cult legend of an obscure

¹ Cf. von Rad, 'Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch', in *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* [Munich, 1958], 68 ff., 74.

sanctuary in the Negeb.¹ Indeed his views regarding the preservation and transmission of the patriarchal traditions are still of importance for European form-critics: namely, that the stories were attached to various cultic places where they survived until gathered together to form the unified tradition we now have. This is a historical judgment of capital importance, for which, however, there is unfortunately no proof whatever. That the stories regarding Bethel in chs. 28 and 35 are written in their present form with the later Israelite sanctuary in view is quite clear. Nevertheless, the close philological investigation of the sources to prove the point does not reveal whether authentic old traditions were told and refracted in the light of the later sanctuary or whether the stories were constructed as pure aetiologies on a minimum of historical tradition. By what objective criteria can it be presumed to be more probable that the later cultic tradition which now holds the various items of the epic together is the more or less artificial construction of the cultus out of disparate themes from different cultic centres, but that it is less probable that there was always one central confessional story connected, not so much with a cult *place* as with a particular group of *people* who found in it the explanation of their existence? To reason for the first against the second on the basis of the presence of this or that theme in the cultic confessions is dangerous when the liturgical history of the cult is not well known.

The purpose of these all too brief remarks is not to decry the methods of study being pursued by the students of Form-Criticism and the history of tradition, but instead to suggest that historical judgments are constantly being made, and must be made, by any scholar involved in this type of study. Hence von Rad's description of the new form critical era may be a bit one-sided, for *the form critic does indeed attempt to step from his forms and traditions into historical backgrounds and origins*. And because his eye has been fixed on fragments he is inclined to argue that the fragmentary is primary, while that which unifies the fragments is liturgical, late, secondary. But this is the type of historical conclusion which Form-Criticism and tradition-history are ill-equipped to make by themselves alone. Consequently, in my judgment it is not on a par with the data gained from archaeological investigations. Even the latter, however, cannot be used alone in historical reconstruction, but only as one means of gathering primary data for the hypotheses whereby the details of ancient life are given order and meaning.

¹ H. Gunkel, *Genesis* [HAT; Göttingen; 5th ed. 1922], 236-242.

With regard to the Genesis narratives, however, archaeology cannot contribute as much to the direct solution of issues posed by the form-critic as it can for the thirteenth century and the Mosaic era. Archaeologically-minded students claim only that sufficient evidence has now been accumulated to fix the era in which the bulk of the patriarchal narratives, and indeed the patriarchs themselves, must have originated. That is in the 'Amorite' age of the first half of the second millennium B.C.² In other words, the oral tradition behind the present written narratives has preserved sufficient background to make possible the assertion that the patriarchal tradition is at least authentic in the sense that it can be fitted into an actual historical era of ancient history.

We now have available two excellent histories of Israel which indicate the radically different approaches to the subject that the differing opinions and methods described above have brought forth. The one is by Martin Noth (*The History of Israel* [Eng. tr. of the 2nd German edition by Stanley Godman, London and New York, 1958]); the other by John Bright (*A History of Israel* [Philadelphia, 1959]). The first is a product of the form-critical approach as developed by Gunkel and Albrecht Alt. The second was written in America by one trained in the historical methods of W. F. Albright. Let us review briefly the manner in which each book treats our subject.

² There is not space here to treat the minority position that the patriarchal narratives and Amarna period of the fourteenth century are related: see especially C. H. Gordon, *Introduction to Old Testament Times* [Ventnor, N.J., 1953], 75, 102-104; *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, xiii. [1954], 56-59; and H. H. Rowley, *From Joseph to Joshua* [London, 1950], 109-130—the latter holding that the end of the Patriarchal Age is to be placed this late. There could be no objection to this view, if only isolated fragments of the epic were derived from this later period; but in so far as the argument is based on the genealogies which record only three generations between Abraham and Moses, it is proper to cite the convincing thesis of D. N. Freedman in an unpublished paper. This is to the effect that Hebrew tradition preserved certain genealogies back to the Mosaic era but beyond that there was none preserved, except the names of clan and tribe. For example, Nu 16: 'Korah, the son of Izhar, the son of Kohath, the son of Levi', simply means 'Korah ben Izhar of the Kohath clan of the tribe of Levi'. The parallels to the fifteenth century Nuzi texts are hardly pertinent except in a very general way for chronology, because the social customs and customary law in question surely did not originate with the Hurrians, but instead portray the life of a certain type of second millennium society (cf. also the much earlier Capadocian texts, see note 1 on next page).

Noth begins his history with the question as to the identity of Israel. Since the term has its first definable meaning as the name of the Hebrew Twelve Tribe League in Palestine, this is the point where the history of Israel must begin. Hence after sections on the land and the historical situation *c.* 1200 B.C., the author proceeds to the discussion of the confederacy, introducing it with a chapter on the origin of the tribes (*i.e.*, all came into being on the soil of Palestine as the union of various geographically placed clans; the traditions of the Mosaic amphictyony and the conquest of Joshua are unhistorical).

The patriarchs represent one of the traditions that survived in the Twelve Tribe League. Central to it was the theme of the promise of the land and the aetiological traditions concerning the individual 'fathers' as founders of cultic shrines used by later Israelites. 'The tradition of the patriarchs was conceived and developed' (p. 120; italics mine) in the Tribal League from the perspective of the Divine guidance which led to the occupation of the land. The patriarchs were actual historical personages because a prominent element in the tradition is that concerned with the worship of the 'God of the fathers', a type of worship of ancestral gods which can be illustrated further by similar phenomena in the Hellenistic-Roman period. (This follows Alt's *Der Gott der Väter* [1929]; and nothing is said about the apt comparisons to be drawn from early second millennium sources.¹) The descendants first established this worship in Palestine after they had settled there and had seen the promises of the land fulfilled. Since the main Pentateuchal traditions were developed by the central Palestinian tribes, the figures of Jacob and Joseph are central. Joseph was associated with the sanctuaries of Shechem and Bethel, and he, 'to begin with, [was] the sole representative of the patriarchs', and because of his association with the occupation of the land he was acknowledged by all Israel. Jacob, however, was known as the one who received the promises, and he 'logically became the Ancestor of the whole of Israel and the eponyms of the twelve tribes became his sons'. This central Palestinian tradition 'was further developed by the southern tribes' to whom belonged Abraham and Isaac (Mamre and Beersheba) who 'were given genealogical precedence over Jacob'.

¹ Cf. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, ch. 4 B; J. Lewy, 'Les Textes paléo-Assyriens et l'Ancien Testament', in *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, cx. [1934] 29-65, especially 50 ff.; cf. also J. Philip Hyatt, *Vetus Testamentum*, v. [1955] 131-132; T. Jacobsen, in *The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man* [Chicago, 1946; or Penguin edition, *Before Philosophy*], 203-204 (on 'The Personal God').

As to the identity of the patriarchs, Gn 14 is the only narrative which associates Abraham with anything definite in ancient history. This chapter is so isolated, however, that it is a question whether it actually belongs to the authentic foundations of the tradition. Besides the narrative has not yielded to historical elucidation. While 'it may be feasible to see their history within the framework of the migratory movement of the nineteenth-eighteenth centuries, . . . it is more likely that the historical figures of the patriarchs, however tangible, already belonged to the "Aramaic migration", at the turn of the thirteen-twelfth centuries'. 'It may be assumed that numerous "patriarchs" were well known among the Israelite tribes. The fact that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were particularly remembered was due to the peculiar evolution of the Pentateuch tradition.'

To one trained in another scholarly tradition it is very difficult to avoid uttering the query as to whether much of this is not entirely too subjective. Is it really history at all? Does tradition-history as a method of tracing tradition-forms really permit such *historical* conclusions to be drawn from it, or do we have here a method misused? Do the unproved assumptions of the primacy of the fragmentary and the attachment of sacred traditions always to places rather than to people commend themselves as sufficiently well-based to form the almost exclusive cornerstones of historical reconstruction? Would not the historian be on firmer ground if he simply said, 'We do not know'?

Bright's work comes at the patriarchal problem in a very different manner. A Prologue presents a concise survey of Near Eastern history before 2000 B.C. and Part One is entitled 'Antecedents and Beginnings: The Age of the Patriarchs'. The first chapter in this section gives a précis of Near Eastern history in the first half of the second millennium B.C. because the author believes it to be the scene of Israel's pre-history as a people, the age to which the patriarchal traditions refer. The second chapter on the patriarchs is introduced by a section on method. Here the author points to the problem of the sources, the past attempts to solve it, and to the many forms used from older sources by the common parent, whether oral or written is unknown, of both the J and E compilations of the epic. But 'the precise circumstances under which the various traditions originated and developed lie beyond our knowledge, and probably always will. Attempts to reconstruct a complete tradition-history [referring especially to the work of Noth] are too speculative, and too little based upon objective evidence, to command confidence' (p. 66). Of one thing we may be sure, the actual historical situation was far more complex than

the present narratives might suggest, and 'the traditions undoubtedly underwent a process of selection, refraction, and normalization'.

Since it is impossible by any objective means to get within the details of the traditions, 'we would do well to confine ourselves to a method as rigidly objective as possible . . . The only safe and proper course lies in a balanced examination of the traditions against the background of the world of the day and, in the light of that, making such positive statements as the evidence allows. Hypothetical reconstructions, plausible though these may be, are to be eschewed. Much must remain obscure. But enough can be said to make it certain that the patriarchal traditions are firmly anchored in history.'

Bright then surveys the evidence that the stories fit 'unquestionably and authentically in the milieu of the second millennium, specifically in that of the centuries sketched in the preceding chapter, and not in that of any later period. This may be registered as a historical fact'. He first surveys the early Hebrew onomasticon in relation to that of the 'Amorites' in the Middle Bronze Age as distinct from the greatly mixed situation in Palestine, beginning in the Late Bronze Age. He then deals with patriarchal customs, mode of life, date, traditional relation to northern Mesopotamia, to the Aramaeans, to the Khapiru, etc. He concludes that the patriarchs were historical figures, a part of that migration of semi-nomadic clans which brought a new population to Palestine in the early centuries of the second millennium. 'These were clans such as we read about in the Execration texts and elsewhere. Many of them soon settled where they could find land, and organized themselves into city-states with a feudal pattern . . . No doubt all of them had traditions of migration, most of which were in the course of time forgotten. Since many of these peoples were ultimately to contribute to the bloodstream of Israel, we are warned that Israel's origins were actually exceedingly complex.' Nevertheless, that they ultimately stemmed from 'the plain of Aram' in Mesopotamia cannot be gainsaid. It is not unlikely also that as early as the Hyksos period some of their number (*e.g.*,

Joseph) found their way to Egypt, to be followed subsequently, under pressure of hard times, by others.

As for patriarchal religion, Bright continues, in spite of the difficulties of saying anything about it, it surely is now quite wrong to dismiss the Biblical evidence as simply anachronistic. It is clearly of a type at home in its world; a clan religion in which the clan was considered the family of a patron deity, with a simple cultus which, however, was never completely localized but always the cult of the clan wherever it was. And the promise and covenant embedded within it became the means whereby Yahwism was later to interpret God's gift of the land as fulfilment. In spite of the great gaps in our knowledge, the patriarchal era stands in the truest sense at the beginning of Israel's history and faith. Not only did certain dominant components of Israel move into Palestine at this time, but 'their peculiar beliefs helped to shape the faith of Israel as it later was to be. With them, too, there began that restless search for the fulfilment of promise which, though fulfilled in the giving of land and seed, could never be satisfied with that gift; but, like a pointing finger through all the Old Testament, must guide to a city "whose builder and maker is God" (Heb 11¹⁰).'

The amount of space which Bright accords the patriarchal narratives is, of course, more extensive than that of Noth. And in the brief space here available I have not done full justice to the position of either scholar. Perhaps the purpose of this article has been fulfilled, however, if some of the basic issues confronting the Biblical historian to-day have been assessed. It should be noted, however, that for the Biblical teacher, at least, the disagreements noted between the form-critic, on the one hand, and the historian who would employ archaeology to its full extent while remaining fundamentally suspicious of the use of Form-Criticism as the sole basis for historical judgments—this is not a purely academic matter. Before one can teach a course in the Old Testament, or expound a text from the early epic, he must have given some thought to this matter and have decided where he will take his stand.

Hellenistic Thought in New Testament Times

The Sceptics

The Way of the Abandoned Struggle

BY THE REVEREND WILLIAM BARCLAY, D.D., THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

THE aim of all the Hellenistic philosophies was the attainment of peace of mind, serenity, quietude, *ἀταραξία*. The Sceptics found this peace of mind in *ἐποχή*, which means complete suspension of judgment, and which they defined as a 'state of mental rest in which we neither deny or affirm anything'.¹ The Sceptics arrived at this position from the belief that there is nothing in this world which is indisputably certain. No sense impression can be certain; a tower may look round in shape from a distance and square close at hand; a thing will taste sweet or bitter according to that which has been tasted immediately before it. No intellectual conclusion can be absolutely certain. To every proposition and to every argument an equal proposition and an equal argument may be opposed.² The order of the heavenly bodies may be taken to prove the existence of Providence, but that the good so often fare ill in this world may be taken to disprove the existence of Providence.³ The basic word of Scepticism is *ἰσοσθένεια*, which R. G. Bury translates 'equipollence', which Edwyn Bevan translates 'equal strength on both sides of every question', and which M. M. Patrick translates 'the equal weight of things opposed'.⁴

In view of this complete uncertainty of knowledge, no matter by what channel it may come, and in view of this *ἰσοσθένεια*, the only possible course is *ἐποχή*, complete suspension of judgment. So long as a man seeks to decide between one alternative and another, he is inevitably in a state of mental tension. Let him simply abandon the struggle, let him accept the fact that he cannot know, let him simply suspend judgment, and peace of mind immediately follows. *Ἀταραξία* follows *ἐποχή*, peace of mind follows suspension of judgment, as surely as a shadow follows its subject.⁵

¹ Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism*, i. 10.

² Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines*, i. 12; i. 202.

³ Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines*, i. 32.

⁴ R. G. Bury in the translation of Sextus Empiricus in the 'Loeb Classical Library'; E. Bevan, *Stoics and Sceptics*, 124; M. M. Patrick, *Sextus Empiricus and Greek Scepticism*, 25.

⁵ Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines*, i. 29; Diogenes Laertius, ix. 105.

As Bevan puts it: 'The unhappy desire to know was the cause of all the fever and the fret, the polemical passion and torturing doubt. Once grasp the fact that the desire was essentially futile, that you could let the mind play and *hold it back* all the while from fixed belief, and there was no reason that you should not be perfectly happy and contented in nescience. It was a wonderful deliverance to realize that you need not mind not knowing.' The Sceptic injunction comes simply to the advice not to bother oneself.⁶

The Sceptics held that this discovery had been made, as it were, by accident. The first Sceptic had been struggling with the tension between two alternatives in theory or belief; he had for a moment abandoned the struggle; and, behold, peace of mind descended upon him. It was like what had happened to Apelles, the court painter of Alexander the Great. He was painting a horse, and was trying to depict the horse's foam. Attempt after attempt failed. At last in disgust he violently flung at the picture the sponge on which he wiped his brushes, and, behold, the mark of the sponge perfectly produced the effect of the horse's foam, which had defied all his laborious efforts to reproduce.⁷ He had achieved his object by abandoning the struggle. So Scepticism is a mental attitude which first realizes the equal weight of things opposed, and in view of it suspends judgment, and thereafter finds *ἀταραξία*, repose and tranquillity of soul.⁸

Pyrrho of Elis (360–270 B.C.) was the founder of Scepticism. The Sceptics were called by many names, the Zetetics, from their activity in investigation and enquiry, the Ephectics, or suspensives, from the state of mind produced in the enquirer by the search, the Aporetics, or dubitatives, from the habit of seeking and doubting, and from their deliberate indecision in denial and assent. But Sextus Empiricus was certain that the only right name for the school was the Pyrrhoneans in memory of their founder.⁹ Pyrrho

⁶ E. Bevan, *Stoics and Sceptics*, 124.

⁷ Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines*, i. 28, 29.

⁸ Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines*, i. 8.

⁹ Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines*, i. 7; cf. Diogenes Laertius, ix. 69, 70.

of Elis left no writings, and we are indebted to Timon his successor (320-230 B.C.) for our knowledge of Pyrrho's views.¹ From Timon we learn that Pyrrho asked three basic questions to which he gave three basic answers.² The three questions were: What is the nature of things? What ought our attitude to things to be? What is the gain resulting from such an attitude? The answer to the first question is that we know nothing of the nature of things. We only know what things *appear to be*. Fire burns, said the Sceptic, we perceive; as to whether it is its nature to burn, we suspend judgment. 'I do not lay it down that honey is sweet', says Timon, 'but I admit that it appears to be so.'³ The answer to the second question follows from this. Since we can know nothing except what a thing appears to be at any given moment, and since the ultimate nature of things is quite unknown to us, then the right attitude to all things is to suspend judgment. The answer to the third question is that the consequence of this suspension of judgment is peace of mind. Pyrrho came 'to mark all dogma with a query',⁴ and thereby to offer tranquillity and rest.

In view of this the Sceptics had a series of watchwords, words, phrases, and expressions in which their attitude to all things was summed up, and in which their advice for life was given.⁵

There is the phrase *οὐδὲν μᾶλλον*, which means, 'Not more!', and which is elliptical for, 'Not this more than that, up than down', or, to put it in the form of a question, 'Why this more than that?' There was the word *ἰσοσθένεια*, which is 'equality in respect of what seems probable', or, 'equality in credibility, or non-credibility'. This produced a state of *ἀρρεψία*, which means equipoise, the refusal to assent to either alternative. Very naturally this issued in *ἀφασία*, which means *non-assertion*, the avoidance of all positive assertion, which comes from the mental attitude which refuses to affirm or deny anything.

There were certain stock phrases which were indicative of this attitude of non-assertion, *τάχα οὐ τάχα*, 'perhaps and perhaps not', *ἔξεστι οὐκ ἔξεστι*, 'possibly and possibly not', *ἐνδέχεται οὐκ ἐνδέχεται*, 'may be and may be not'. All these phrases express the Sceptic refusal to commit oneself to any definite assertion.

'*Ἐπέχω*, said the Sceptic, which means, 'I

¹ For Pyrrho's life see Diogenes Laertius, ix. 61-108, and for Timon's life see Diogenes Laertius, ix. 109-116.

² Aristocles in Eusebius, *The Preparation for the Gospel*, 758 C D.

³ Diogenes Laertius, ix. 105.

⁴ E. Bevan, *Stoics and Sceptics*, 123.

⁵ There is an account of these phrases and watchwords in Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines*, i. 188-200.

suspend judgment', thereby indicating that to him all views are equal in credibility and in non-credibility. *Οὐδὲν ὀρίζω*, said the Sceptic, which means, 'I determine nothing'. 'To determine' a thing is not simply to state what a thing appears to be; it is to put forward something which is non-evident, and which is yet combined with assent. *Πάντα ἐστὶν ἀόριστα*, said the Sceptic, which means, 'All things are undetermined'. *Πάντα ἐστὶν ἀκατάληπτα*, said the Sceptic, which means, 'All things are not apprehensible'.

It is to be clearly noted that the Sceptic made none of these statements dogmatically, and that each of them includes itself. If the Sceptic said, 'I determine nothing', then he did not even determine that very statement. To the Sceptic it was not even certain that nothing was certain. Proclus declared that the statement that all things are uncertain is an 'altogether silly' statement, because it destroys itself, and may be likened to some cathartic drug, which purges out itself together with the excrements.⁶

The whole Sceptic attitude to the possibility of knowledge is summed up in the ten modes (*τρόποι*) of perplexity, or the ten sceptical tropes.⁷

(1) There is the trope based on variety of animals, based on the differences between living creatures, in respect of those things which give them pleasure or pain, or which are beneficial or harmful to them.⁸ The hawk is clear sighted and will see things quite differently from some purblind creature. The dog has a keen sense of smell and will become aware of things quite differently from an animal with no sense of smell. The goat finds vineshoots good to eat, man finds them bitter. Quails thrive on hemlock which for men is poisonous. Pigs eat ordure, horses do not. There is nothing which can be said of anything which would be true for every animal.

(2) There is the trope which is based on differences between men.⁹ In men there are differences due to the idiosyncracies of their natures. Demophon, Alexander's butler, shivered in the sun or in a hot bath, and felt warm in the shade. Athenagoras of Argos took no harm from a scorpion's sting. The Psylli are impervious to snake-bites and the Tentyries are unharmed by crocodiles. Rufinus of Chalcis enjoyed drinking hellebore, while pepper gave Chrysermos of

⁶ Proclus in Eusebius, *The Preparation for the Gospel*, 762 A B.

⁷ These are sketched in Diogenes Laertius, ix. 79-88, and are stated much more fully in Sextus Empiricus *Outlines*, i. 36-163.

⁸ Diogenes Laertius, ix. 79, 80; Sextus Empiricus *Outlines*, i. 40-78.

⁹ Diogenes Laertius, ix. 81; Sextus Empiricus *Outlines*, i. 79-89.

Herophilos the stomach-ache, Andron the Argive could journey through the Libyan desert and never feel thirst, while the Emperor Tiberius could see in the dark. An old woman of Attica could drink hemlock by the glass, and Lysis could swallow four drachms of opium and take no harm. There is nothing of which it can be said that it is good for all, and nothing of which it can be said that it is bad for all.

(3) There is the trope which is based on differences in the constitution of the sense organs and channels, and on differences in perception.¹ A thing may seem pleasant to one sense and unpleasant to another. Honey is pleasant to the tongue, but unpleasant to the eyes. Myrrh is pleasant to smell, but unpleasant to taste. Whether, therefore, are they pleasant or unpleasant? An apple is pale yellow to the sight, sweet to the taste, fragrant to the smell. What, then, is it really? We have five senses, but it is certain that, if we had more or fewer senses, things would appear quite differently. There is nothing which can be said of anything which is true of all the senses.

(4) There is the trope which is based on circumstances.² How a thing appears to anyone depends on health, illness, sleep, waking, joy, sorrow, youth, age, courage, fear, want, fullness, hate, love, heat, cold, free or restricted breathing-passages. And since no man remains always the same, the same thing appears differently even to the same man. Air may seem cold to the aged and warm to those in their prime. Colour may seem bright to the young and dim to the aged. 'Many also that love ugly women consider them very beautiful.' The vestibule to the baths warms those who go in and cools those who go out. What anything appears to be, depends entirely on the condition of the seer.

(5) There is the trope which is based on position, distance, and place.³ How a thing appears depends on the distance and the angle and the position from which it is seen. A lamp appears dim in the sun and bright in the dark; a rudder appears broken in the sea and straight out of it. The colours on the neck of a dove appear different from different angles and in different lights. Nothing can be seen apart from place and position; therefore, nothing can be seen as it is in itself.

(6) There is the trope based upon mixtures.⁴ Nothing is ever seen alone. It is always in some

combination with air, light, moisture, solidity, heat, cold, movement. Purple looks quite different in sunlight, moonlight and lamplight. A rock which is very heavy in the air is easily lifted under water. A man with jaundice sees everything yellow. Here, again, we are at the conclusion that nothing can be seen as it is, but must always be seen in ever-varying combinations and mixtures.

(7) There is the trope that is based on quantities and constitutions.⁵ Heat and cold, up and down, big and small are completely relative terms. If you file metal or horn, the filings will have a different colour from solid metal or solid horn. A thing, for instance wine, may be beneficial in moderation, and harmful in quantity. Anything that is said of the thing is relative to comparison or to quantity, and, therefore, nothing can be said of the thing itself.

(8) There is the trope based on relation.⁶ A man may be strong in relation to one man and weak in relation to another man. If a thing is said to be on the right hand, it is only so by position and will be on the left hand of something else. Anything that is said of anything describes it, not in itself, but only in relation to something else.

(9) There is the trope based on frequency and rarity.⁷ An earthquake is no surprise to those who live in an area in which earthquakes are frequent, but terrorizes those who do not. The rising of the sun is no surprise, but the rising of a comet is because it is rare. The value of anything depends on rarity, as, for instance, in the case of gold. The law of supply and demand can alter the value of anything. Of the thing itself we know nothing, because the rarity or the frequency with which it occurs alters it, so that a thing may be precious at one time and valueless at another.

(10) There is the trope based on systems, customs, and laws.⁸ It is law and custom and mythology and dogma which decide whether a thing is beautiful or ugly, true or false, good or bad, just or unjust. The Persians legalize homosexuality, the Romans do not; amongst the Persians incest is practised, and amongst the Egyptians marriage with a sister, both of which are abhorrent to a Greek. Indians have intercourse in public, other nations count it a shame. Right and wrong, goodness and badness, morality and immorality do not exist in themselves, but only in law, custom, and convention.

¹ Diogenes Laertius, ix. 81; Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines*, i. 90-99.

² Diogenes Laertius, ix. 82; Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines*, i. 100-117.

³ Diogenes Laertius, ix. 85, 86; Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines*, i. 118-123.

⁴ Diogenes Laertius, ix. 84; Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines*, i. 124-128.

⁵ Diogenes Laertius, ix. 86; Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines*, i. 129-134.

⁶ Diogenes Laertius, ix. 87, 88; Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines*, i. 135-140.

⁷ Diogenes Laertius, ix. 87; Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines*, i. 141-144.

⁸ Diogenes Laertius, ix. 87, 88; Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines*, i. 145-163.

By these ten tropes the Sceptics sought to make it appear that there is no such thing as knowledge of anything in itself. In addition to this there were the five tropes of Agrippa by which it was sought to make it appear that all proof by argument was impossible. The five tropes were based on discord, disagreement, and contradiction; the *regressus in infinitum*; relation; the hypothetical; the *circulus in probando*.¹ The first and third are included in the ten sceptical tropes. The *regressus in infinitum* ran thus. Any statement has to be proved by another statement; the second statement has to be proved by a third statement; and the third by a fourth; and so on to infinity, so that no point can ever be reached where the chain can begin, but proof of proof must go on for ever and ever. To escape this, some one might assume some basic *hypothesis*, but that is strictly forbidden, for not even the most elementary things can be held to be certain. The *circulus in probando* happens when that which should be the proof needs to be sustained by the thing to be proved. It is, for instance, not possible, said the Sceptic, to prove that there are four elements by the fact that there are four elements!

It is abundantly clear that the attitude of the Sceptics must have far-reaching consequences for life. At three of these consequences we must briefly look.

(1) On the face of it Scepticism is the complete paralysis of action. If a man must never make up his mind about anything, then how can he ever act? If he must remain for ever in suspension of judgment, does that not mean that he must remain for ever in suspense of action? Logically it does. The first Sceptic to attempt to answer this was Arcesilaus. A man must act, he said, and he will act on the ground of 'what is reasonable', τὸ εὔλογον. Wisdom produces right action, and right action is that which has a reasonable justification. Therefore, he who attends to 'the reasonable' will be happy.² The man who really faced this problem was Carneades, the greatest of all the Sceptics, who lived in the second century B.C. He produced his doctrine of graduated probability.³ Carneades said that there were three degrees of probability within which there were an infinite number of shades. When a notion by itself produces the impression of truth, without being taken in conjunction with other

notions it is πιθανή, probable. When an impression is confirmed by the agreement of all the notions which are related to it, it is πιθανή καὶ ἀπερίσπαστος, probable and undisputed. When, in any case, an examination of all these related notions results in producing the same confirmation and corroboration for each one of them, an impression is πιθανή καὶ ἀπερίσπαστος καὶ περιωδευμένη, probable, undisputed, and tested.

The truth is that Scepticism in reality precludes action, but a man has to act, and the Sceptic acted, by and large, on common sense.

(2) On the face of it Scepticism is the complete denial of all criteria and of all moral standards. If judgment must always be suspended, then no one thing can ever be better than another; there can be no such thing as good and bad. It is quite true that Carneades in a notorious speech in Rome in 156 B.C. argued that there is no such thing as natural right, that law and justice are no more than an expedient agreement for mutual safety and protection, that self-interest is the real end of life. Great nations like Rome reached power by injustice. An intelligent man can do no other than despise justice.⁴ But it will not do to take Carneades too seriously, for on the previous day he had argued on the other side. The Sceptic recognized a fourfold standard in life.⁵ There is *the guidance of nature*, by which we are naturally capable of sensation and thought. There is *the constraint of the passions*, whereby hunger drives us to food and thirst to drink. There is *the tradition of customs and laws*, through which we regard piety as good and impiety as evil. There is *the instruction of the arts*, whereby 'we are not inactive in the arts which we adopt'. The real Sceptic criterion was nothing other than convention. The Sceptic lives 'in accordance with the normal rules of life', although 'quite undogmatically'.⁶ In point of fact, the Sceptic lived the good life, because he believed it entirely probable that there can be no happiness without virtue.

(3) Obviously Scepticism has the most important effects on religious belief. Carneades violently attacked belief in God. Some said that there must be a God because of the *consensus gentium*, because all men believe in a God. But, in the first place such belief does not exist, and in the second place, if it did, the opinion of an ignorant mass proves nothing.⁷ Men argue to the existence of God from the order of the universe and from reason in man. But what of the things in the

¹ Diogenes Laertius, ix. 88; Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines*, i. 164-186.

² Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos*, vii. 158; in the Loeb translation this is entitled *Against the Logicians*, i. 158.

³ Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines*, i. 227; *Adversus Mathematicos*, vii. (Loeb, *Against the Logicians*, i.) 159-189.

⁴ Lactantius, *Institutes*, v. 15, 16; Cicero, *De Republica*, III. iv. 8-12; *De Finibus*, II. xviii. 59; Quintilian, *Instit. Orat.*, XII. i. 35.

⁵ Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines*, i. 24.

⁶ Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines*, i. 21.

⁷ Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, I. xxiii. 62; III. iv. 2.

universe which destroy life? And what of the fact that men use reason to live like beasts? ¹

The general idea of God is that God is infinite, and yet He is also a person, possessing the qualities of a person. But God cannot be infinite and personal, because personality implies limitation. Any living being is composite, and, therefore, destructible; God, therefore, cannot be a living being.² Every living being possesses the power of sensation by which it receives impressions; but sensation involves change in the soul; therefore, God cannot have sensation.³

God cannot have any virtue, for virtue presupposes a fault to be overcome. He who is continent could be incontinent; he who is brave must meet danger; he who knows no pain can know no pleasure; he who discovers something must have begun by not knowing it. Further, virtue is always *above* its possessor, and how can there be anything above God? ⁴

God cannot be unlimited, for if so He could not move; nor can He be limited for that which is limited is incomplete. God cannot be immaterial, for that which is immaterial has neither soul, feelings, nor activity. Nor can He be material, for that which is material is composite, and,

¹ Cicero, *Academics*, II. xxxviii. 120; *De Natura Deorum*, III. xxv. 65-70; III. xxxi. 78, 79.

² Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, III. xii. 29; III. xiv. 34.

³ Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, III. xiii. 32; Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos*, ix. (Loeb translation, *Against the Physicists*, i.) 139-147.

⁴ Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos*, ix. (Loeb translation, *Against the Physicists*, i.) 152-175.

therefore, liable to destruction, and, if simple, like fire or water, it has neither life nor reason.⁵ There is no form in which God may be thought of; therefore, we cannot assert the existence of God. It is a long time now since Carneades stated the intellectual difficulties of belief, which men have been restating ever since. And yet it may well be that all this was for Carneades mental gymnastics rather than reality, for Pyrrho at least—and he was the founder of Scepticism—was so respected for his piety that his native city made him its high priest.⁶

Such, then, were the beliefs of the Sceptics, or rather their attitude to life, for of beliefs they had none. Their value was that they compelled men mercilessly to examine every dogma; their danger was that they sought to produce a society in which men deliberately and purposely believed in nothing, for they saw the abandonment of all belief as the way to happiness. In the end Scepticism simply died out, for men turned away from it. As Bevan says, Scepticism broke down before 'the exigencies of life . . . before the fact that man is not only a spectator of reality, but a maker of it'. A man suspended in space might be a Sceptic, but not a man who had to act.⁷

The Sceptic said: 'There is nothing to believe'. The Christian said: 'I do believe'. But the Christian belief is in a Person, and of a person a man can be sure.

⁵ Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos*, ix. (Loeb translation, *Against the Physicists*, i.) 148-151, 180.

⁶ Diogenes Laertius, ix. 64.

⁷ E. Bevan, *Stoics and Sceptics*, 141.

Literature

IS THE GOSPEL HISTORY TRUE? ✓

EXPRESSED in the simplest terms the question, Is the gospel history true?, is becoming one of the dominant issues of the day. This is the problem faced by Dr. T. A. Roberts in his *History and Christian Apologetic* (S.P.C.K.; 25s. net). Christianity, he reminds us, is 'a historical religion in the sense that its essence is to be found not in some system of thought and ideas but in something actually achieved by its Founder on the plane of history'. It is therefore of vital importance that we should know how far the account of its origins in the Gospels is reliable. Form-Criticism and Typology have brought this question into the centre of things, and it is essential that we should consider its bearings upon Christian Apologetic.

Dr. Roberts has found an interesting way of bringing the issue into the open. He first con-

siders 'Historical Methodology', that is, the way in which historians go about their task and practise their craft, and in this inquiry he examines briefly the terminology fashionable amongst philosophers and in greater detail the principles laid down by R. G. Collingwood in 'Human Nature and Human History' and by Marc Bloch in 'The Historian's Craft'. He asks whether theologians who have enthusiastically embraced Collingwood's views fully recognize that they are advocating views which rest on a philosophical standpoint, that of post-Kantian idealism, generally discredited and rejected by modern philosophers. He speaks much more favourably of Bloch who holds that history is primarily the attempt to provide knowledge about the activities of men who lived in the past. Strangely enough, he does not mention Troeltsch.

In the second part of his book Dr. Roberts examines 'The Methodology of Historical

Theology' and here he selects for treatment F. C. Burkitt's 'Gospel History and its Transmission' [1906], C. H. Dodd's 'History and the Gospel' [1938], and A. Farrer's 'A Study in St. Mark' [1951]. While recognizing fully the contribution which these scholars have made to Gospel Criticism, he does not hesitate to subject their work to penetrating and forceful examination. He criticizes Burkitt for unduly emphasizing self-consistency as a mark of the historical value of Mark and for the inadequacy of his treatment of miracles. He questions Dodd's attempt to estimate a historical event as an occurrence plus its meaning, and his 'unsatisfactory discussion' of miracles, and he affirms that Farrer's view that Mark is the conscious product of a constructive mind, which subordinates history to theology and symbolism, must end logically is assigning to it 'considerably lower historical value than did either Burkitt or Dodd'. 'As far as it can be judged', he says, 'writing history in terms of prefiguration seems in principle akin to writing a philosophy of history'.

In the third and last section the author treats 'The Historical Element in Christianity'. He insists that the truth of a historical statement is, in principle, established by the applications and canons of historical criticism, and that the believer or the non-believer alike, in his historical activity, can achieve or fail to achieve these standards. The results are never final since new evidence emerges and historical views change even when no new facts have been discovered. He considers the sense in which the Resurrection is historical and examines the claim that Christianity is uniquely a historical religion. We are confronted with a dilemma. Whether the gospel is true must be answered at the first level by a rigorous application of historical criticism with all its techniques and methods; but 'historical criticism is essentially a secular tool, fashioned to meet secular interests, and thus by its nature useless to evaluate the religious affirmations of Faith'. We could wish that Dr. Roberts had helped us to meet this dilemma, but he contents himself with the remark that to pose it is the cardinal aim of his discussion. While we would like more, we cannot blame a writer who sets himself a limited aim, and there can be no doubt that he has made a worthy contribution to a problem of burning importance.

VINCENT TAYLOR

A HISTORY OF ISRAEL

A volume just published by Professor John Bright under the title, *A History of Israel* (Westminster Press, Philadelphia; \$7.50), constitutes an important addition to the long series of volumes

which have already been written on the subject. The plan of the book is simple. The history of Israel is divided into four phases: The Formative Period, the Monarchy (1. The Period of Self-determination, 2. Crisis and Fall), Tragedy and Beyond, and The Formative Period of Judaism. The method of treatment adopted by the author consists firstly of a survey of the general conditions of any period with the aid of all the available evidence produced by archaeological investigation, in order that the prevailing cultural pattern may be clearly defined; secondly, the employment of the Old Testament material to trace the political and social history in it; and, finally, and, in the author's judgment, most significantly, an attempt to make plain what the period under survey meant for Israel's religious ideas and her faith. His standpoint may be designated conservative, but he would doubtless maintain that it is a conservatism which is not to be regarded as dogmatically conditioned but as representing an attitude to which he has been led by what he believes to be the proper or, in some cases, the most plausible interpretation of the evidence.

The whole period which Professor Bright covers in his book is from the patriarchal age to the time of the Maccabees. But wisely he begins with an outline of the ethnic and cultural situation of the Near East c. 2000 B.C. The decision to finish his work with the Old Testament period was largely dictated by considerations of available space. But, he argues, by the time of Ezra Judaism, though not yet fully structured, had emerged; thereafter, the history of Israel may be said to cease, even if, in another sense, it may be said to continue even now. Besides, the revolt of Bar Cochba in A.D. 135, a common terminal for the history of Israel, is a date of historical, but not of religious, significance.

That the history of Israel itself may be set in its historical continuum, Professor Bright recounts the evidence which has been found in the Near East of early cultures from the neolithic period to the end of the third millennium B.C. by which time Palestine had undergone a great urban development and had a predominantly Canaanite population. Towards the end of the third millennium the Amorites invaded the country and worked widespread havoc from which the resident population recovered very slowly.

The whole book deserves careful study, but it may be worth while to indicate the author's point of view on certain subjects. With regard to Moses, he says that the evidence obliges us to trace the essential character and the major aspects of Israel's faith back to him; the sense of the people's election and the concept of covenant go back to the same time. And while the author will

not affirm that the word 'monotheism' in a philosophical sense can be used fittingly of the faith of early Israel, yet, even at Sinai, there was denied any reality to other gods, even if their theoretical existence might not be contradicted. With regard to the entrance of the Israelites into Palestine, it is admitted that it was a complicated process, and that not all the people who later formed part of the Israelite amphictyony had in their ancestry shared in the Exodus from Egypt and in the covenanting at Sinai. But he does not take the view that the Israelite occupation was simply a prolonged process of infiltration; he believes that there was a violent irruption into the land by a large group in the thirteenth century, as is supported by considerable archaeological evidence. The later tribal amphictyony did not create Israel's faith; rather was the faith constitutive of the amphictyony. The Book of the Covenant, he maintains, reflects legal procedures in the pre-monarchic period and his reading of the pentateuchal sources J and E leads him to the conclusion that the major elements of the pentateuchal tradition and the major themes of its theology had already been normalized by the same time.

As for the Exile and the Restoration, Professor Bright shows how these events and the historical circumstances of the times in which they took place occasioned a re-interpretation of Israel's history from a wider standpoint. Thus the return from Babylon was interpreted 'as a re-enactment on a yet vaster scale of the constitutive events of Israel's history', and the rule of Yahweh was conceived to comprehend both Jews and Gentiles, while, on the other hand, there emerged from a contemplation of the same events a new interpretation of Israel's sufferings.

Much more could be said, as that, while placing the work of Ezra after that of Nehemiah, the author gives Ezra the date 428 B.C. for his arrival in Jerusalem, thus accepting a plausible textual emendation which allows, he believes, an intelligent picture of the course of events. All in all, the book is a notable achievement, and even if its conservative standpoint may not gain universal acceptance in every instance, the case which is presented is always carefully argued and the author gives ample evidence that he will not be horrified at the thought or the actuality of some disagreement with some of his conclusions.

JOHN MAUCLINE

THE EARLY CHURCH

Letters from the Early Church, by Canon Roger Lloyd (Allen and Unwin; 13s. 6d. net), is a magnificent book. It takes the story of the Early

Church and tells it in a series of imaginary letters. But the great point of this book is that these letters are based on the soundest scholarship as well as on the most vivid imagination. Again and again the discerning reader will be forced back to Tacitus, to Hegesippus *via* Eusebius, and above all to the New Testament to see where Canon Lloyd gets authority for what he says, and very, very seldom will he have any cause for complaint as to the way in which Canon Lloyd uses his evidence.

The main character may be said to be Silvanus. Sometimes Canon Lloyd administers a gentle rebuke indirectly to popular theories. He speaks—or rather he makes Silvanus speak—about the name *Christian*. 'The pagans first began to use it, but they did not mean anything derogatory or derisive by it. Far from that, the word as spoken by the pagans of this city (Antioch from where Silvanus writes) has an undoubted undertone of respect, and even a hint of affection. What they nicknamed us we now call ourselves.'

Hilarion and his wife Chione tell Silvanus of their conversion. Chione is an intellectual, not given to belief. But when Peter came and talked he did not argue. 'I expected arguments, theories, justifications, and I could easily have demolished them all. . . . But instead of that he showed us a man, and I can think of no argument to touch that.'

There is a masterly sketch of Gallio. On the way to Corinth the ship carrying Gallio was involved in a storm. But Gallio escaped sea-sickness. 'But, then, I'm sure', writes Flavia, 'that nothing so vulgar as sea-sickness would care to attack that icily detached and reserved philosopher!'

Few will read without tears the story of the conversion of the patrician Flavia and her husband Lucius in Corinth and of their subsequent martyrdom in Rome. Few will fail to be moved by the character of the little clerk Persis, secretly inserted into Nero's civil service, as a kind of Christian secret agent, for ever terrified and yet for ever immovably at his post.

We wish that all would buy this book. In it the Early Church comes vividly and intensely alive. There are few books of Church History with a thrill in them like this.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

I AND THOU

Martin Buber's *I and Thou* appeared in German in 1923, and it was made available in an English translation in 1937 by Professor R. Gregor Smith. The publishers (T. and T. Clark; 9s. 6d. net) supply again the second edition of the translation, an edition, however, entirely reset. The previous editions were in a somewhat unattractive paper

cover format. We congratulate the publishers on providing this important book anew and in so pleasant a design.

From the outset this book, small in bulk, often cryptic in expression and idea, exercised a deep influence upon many areas in contemporary thought and inquiry. It was significant socially, psychologically, medically, as well as theologically, and philosophically important. Much has come from Buber's pen since 1923, but it is in this early writing we get vividly presented the conceptual lights that have guided him in reflective paths since. For this reason *I and Thou* retains its unique place and individuality. And as at the beginning so now it exerts a stimulating power especially within the theological area wherein its chief concern is.

This reset edition is increased in value by two new features. Professor Gregor Smith provides a new Preface which is both a commentary upon and an extension of his original one. New readers of Buber will find these comments of the translator exceedingly useful as guidance into the text. Of special interest is a Postscript which the author himself supplies. In it he engages in frank and clarifying observations upon questions and difficulties raised (in reviews and by correspondents) about the basic theme of the book.

I and Thou does not lend itself easily to any brief description, for the book combines into itself many elements just as Buber himself does, for he is poet, mystic, philosopher, and deeply religious man. There is a striking anticipation of Buber's mind in the not yet fully appreciated book 'Grace and Personality' by John Oman which appeared in 1917. Grace for Oman can be understood and participated in only within the 'forms of the personal', yet grace, the grace of the Supernatural, of God is never apart from a right existence in and use of the natural. This is Buber's basic concern also. Religious life is relation; faith exists because of the Supernatural as Presence. This is neither measurable by feeling nor by dogmatic form; neither again is it separable from the concrete encounters man has amid the actualities of his world. *I and Thou*, bringing together the Jewish and Christian traditions, is an urgent plea, on evangelical grounds, for a personalism in religion that unites elements which too often both in doctrine and in practice, have been sundered.

JOHN MACLEOD

PROFESSOR TASKER ON THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Many who have been using, to their great profit, the Tyndale Commentaries on Acts and

the Epistles, have been looking forward eagerly to the treatment of the Gospels. The first to be published is by the Rev. Professor R. V. G. Tasker, the General Editor of the series—*The Gospel according to St. John: An Introduction and Commentary* (Tyndale Press; 9s. 6d. net).

Professor Tasker writes for those, and he knows from experience that they are many, who are more hindered than helped by the large commentaries. But he is under no illusion as to the difficulties presented to the writer by a smaller book. It is a tribute both to his integrity and his insight that in reducing the scope he does not gloss over the difficulties.

The Introduction deals only with authorship, date, and purpose. Working on the sound principle that tradition must be accepted where it cannot be disproved, the author shows the strength of the evidence, internal and external, for the son of Zebedee as the authority if not the writer of the book. The argument for a date at the close of the first century is strongly made. The section on 'Purpose' contains an attractive exposition of Clement's 'Spiritual Gospel', but it might possibly have been strengthened by something more than a passing reference to recent works on the religious background, and to the implications of Qumrān.

The Commentary divides the Gospel into ten sections, with sub-sections each expounded by running commentary, and additional notes on points of detail and special difficulty. The exposition runs smoothly and is clearly the work of a skilled and experienced teacher. The notes, firmly but unobtrusively, show the hand of the grammarian and textual critic. It is to be hoped that readers will take note that these disciplines are not without their value in the understanding of the Word of God.

In dealing with passages of notorious difficulty, Professor Tasker does not set various interpretations side by side leaving the reader to choose. He sets out clearly and simply his own interpretation. The miracle at Cana, for example, 'is not a purposeless exhibition of supernatural power, but a teaching miracle of deep significance'. As against those who compare this 'luxury' miracle with the healings, he points out, cogently, that 'none of the miracles of Jesus were kind actions to alleviate human distress and nothing more'. In dealing with the raising of Lazarus, however, it could be wished that Professor Tasker had dealt more fully with the problem raised by the omission of the event from the Synoptic record.

No criticism, however, of what Professor Tasker does not say must detract from the value of what he does say. This is a Commentary which will be used gladly not only by some with 'neither the

leisure nor the aptitude for studying the larger commentaries' but also by many who have both.

We take note, also, of the simultaneous publication of another volume in the series—*The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians and Philemon*, by the Rev. Herbert M. Carson, B.A., B.D. (Tyndale Press; 7s. 6d. net). The fact that this Commentary originated in a series of sermons may account for the element of wordiness and lack of conciseness which detracts somewhat from the value of an exposition which has otherwise much to commend it.

MARCUS WARD

Albert Schweitzer, by Mr. Gabriel Langfeldt (Allen and Unwin; 12s. 6d. net), adds nothing to our knowledge of the subject, but tells us much about the controversy, especially in Norway, over his status as a Christian. The author, while resenting suggestions, from the side of orthodox Christianity, that Schweitzer should be regarded, for example, as being more a Buddhist than a Christian, devotes this study of Schweitzer's philosophy of life to demonstrating what, at best, may be called his agnosticism. The book raises, in an acute form, the problem of reconciling Schweitzer's earlier and later utterances; his writings and his actions.

The doubts, in some quarters, as to the possibility of reconstructing the 'Life' of Jesus have no effect on the zeal and enthusiasm of those who believe that this task can be done and ought to be done. Among the latter is Dr. Bo Giertz, Bishop of Gothenburg, whose reconstruction, in the form of a novel, has won wide acclaim in Sweden. Now we have an English translation, by Maurice Michael, *With My Own Eyes* (Allen and Unwin; 18s. net). The author has used his wide and intimate knowledge of Palestine to very good effect and so far as background goes there is the note of authenticity. In the detail of the actual story imagination has been given full play. To take a simple instance, why is it necessary to say that Pilate had 'a white, podgy hand'? The implications of this go deeper. Too anxious an attempt 'to make Jesus contemporary' may make Him less so than the One who, in the Gospels, is 'the same yesterday and to-day, yea and for ever'.

The Athlone Press has published at 3s. net *Is There a Christian Ethic?*, by Dr. Nathaniel Micklem, being the first John Coffin Memorial Lecture delivered before the University of London in October 1959. The veteran lecturer, while claiming that with Jesus Christ there came into the world new ethical insights and a new power of life, holds that in the public life of the world

there is no necessary distinction between the actions taken by Christians and by other men. It is, therefore, misleading to speak of a Christian ethic. On the other hand, in principle Divine love so fills the heart of the Christian that morality for him is no negative abstinence from evil and no bare fulfilment of natural duties, but a positive eager endeavour for the good of all men, inspired by faith in the ultimate triumph of good.

What Churches of Christ Stand For, by Dr. William Robinson, M.A., S.T.D., formerly Principal of Overdale College (Berean Press), is a fourth edition of a book first published nearly twenty-five years ago. It contains an excellent account of the origin, growth, message, and contribution to the Universal Church of a nineteenth-century movement known as the Churches of Christ or the Disciples, which plays an important part in matters ecumenical.

In 1954 there first appeared *The Historic Episcopate: Six Essays* by Priests of the Church of England edited by Canon Kenneth M. Carey and it was reviewed in this journal in August, 1954. We have pleasure in drawing attention to the second edition which has been published by Messrs. A. and C. Black (8s. 6d. net). This is substantially unaltered from the first edition with the omission of the 1954 Introduction and the last chapter, both of which were related almost entirely to the Church of South India. The contributors of the six essays are the Bishop Suffragan of Woolwich, the Rt. Rev. J. A. T. Robinson; the Vicar of St. Thomas's, Kirkholt, Rochdale, the Rev. W. H. Vanstone; the Rev. K. J. Woolcombe, Fellow and Chaplain of St. John's College, Oxford; the Rev. B. D. Till, Fellow and Dean of Jesus College, Cambridge; the Warden of Bishop's Hostel, Lincoln, the Rev. A. B. Webster; and the Rev. H. W. Montefiore, Fellow and Dean of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.

In this second edition of Dr. Paul Kahle's *Schweich Lectures* published in 1947—*The Cairo Geniza* (Blackwell; 50s. net)—the three main divisions of the Lectures—General Introduction, The Hebrew Text of the Bible, and The Translations of the Bible—are retained. Much of the original text of the Lectures too remains. But a large amount of new material has been added, and the whole work has been brought up to date. The result is a highly important book.

The new material includes Hebrew texts with Babylonian and Palestinian vocalisation; documents from the Dead Sea, in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek; specimens of the pronunciation of Hebrew by the Samaritans, as recorded in Nablus;

fresh Targum texts; papyri fragments containing portions of the Greek Old Testament; and a leather scroll of the Minor Prophets in Greek. The success which has attended the attempt to go behind the Hebrew text which the Massoretes of Tiberias created to an earlier stage of it, and the strides which have been made in the recovery of the pronunciation of ancient Hebrew, to an extent indeed when the construction of a pre-Massoretic grammar seems a real possibility, are but two examples of the advance in knowledge which the new material has made possible, and which will be of interest to all students of the Hebrew Bible.

There is no half-way house about imaginative reconstructions. They either splendidly succeed or they ignominiously fail. *Letters of Caiaphas to Annas*, by the Rev. James Martin (Bles; 9s. 6d. net), consistently succeeds.

In it in a series of letters Caiaphas shows to Annas the increasing bewilderment of his mind at the events which followed the death of Jesus. The book shows Caiaphas being steadily driven into a mental corner, and refusing to succumb to the evidence. Explanation after explanation of the disappearance of the body of Christ and of the emergence of His disciples as men of courage and power collapses beneath him, and his irritated resentment grows and increases. Necessarily this is an unfinished story, and the end is dramatically correct.

It is worth noting that the book is beautifully printed and produced. Imaginative this study is, but it is also a real contribution to the understanding of the earliest days of Christianity.

In 1935 Professor John Knox published a study of Philemon. In 1959 it was revised and published by the Abingdon Press and was noticed in the September issue of this journal (the first item under 'Notes of Recent Exposition'). Now we welcome an edition published in England by Messrs. Collins—*Philemon Among the Letters of Paul* (10s. 6d. net).

The name of Dr. H. F. Mathews needs no introduction to those whose work lies in the field of Religious Education. Under the general editorship of Dr. Mathews the Epworth Press is publishing what is described as 'A Complete Bible Course for Secondary Schools', entitled as a series 'The King's Way'. In each section there are two volumes, one a class text-book, and the other a book for the teacher on the same subject. We have to hand the two volumes entitled *Prophets of the King*, of which the text-book volume costs 7s. 6d. and the teacher's volume 8s. 6d. net.

These volumes deal with the earliest prophets—Elijah, Micaiah, Elisha; the eighth-century prophets—Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah; the seventh-century prophets—Deuteronomy, Jeremiah; the prophets of the Exile—Ezekiel and Second Isaiah.

In the text-book volume all the resources of teaching are used—the time-chart, the line drawing, the reproduced picture, the cross-word, and even something very like the strip cartoon, and, of course, most excellent maps. There are questions for discussion which make the lessons completely relevant to the life of the pupil; and there is notebook work for the purposes of memory and of the pupil's own research.

The general line of the books may be seen from Dr. Mathews' chart entitled 'The Peaks of Prophecy'. The message of Elijah and Elisha is that Yahweh is the God of Israel. The message of Amos is that Yahweh is a just God. Hosea made the discovery that Yahweh is a God of love. Isaiah came to say that Yahweh is holy. The prophets of the Second Law whose work is in Deuteronomy laid it down that Yahweh desires kindness from His people and worship in Jerusalem. Jeremiah's contribution was to say that religion is personal and spiritual. Ezekiel said that a new loyalty to Yahweh will find its fulfilment of worship in a new Temple. The Unknown Prophet whom we know as Second Isaiah announced to men that Yahweh is Lord over all the earth.

The book for teachers provides excellent material. Dr. Mathews' aliveness to the problems of practical teaching is well seen in the warning about the teaching of the story of Hosea: 'Teachers will know that, in their own classes, some children may have personal experience of the broken home which is the theme of Hosea's oracles; and they would not want to do anything to occasion distress to the children they are teaching'.

These are excellent books. They tackle a difficult teaching subject with conspicuous success. Preachers as well as teachers will find them of quite outstanding value.

The Making of the Church, by the Rev. J. G. Davies, M.A., D.D., Reader in Theology in the University of Birmingham (Skeffington; 21s. net), is the fourth volume in 'The Seekers' Library'. It may be described as early Church History without tears. The interest of the narrative never flags, and, as might be expected of Dr. Davies, the social life of the Church receives adequate attention. We commend the book heartily. There is a misprint in the last line of p. 58 and a curious mistake about Columba on p. 26.

'The Door of the Sheep'

(Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων)—John x. 7-9

BY THE REVEREND ERIC F. F. BISHOP, REDHILL, SURREY

'The harsh change in the figure from shepherd to door would be easier to understand if we might think of the Oriental shepherd as sometimes lying in the narrow entrance to the fold to guard against intruders' (W. F. Howard, in *The Interpreter's Bible*, viii. 625).

'When Jesus announces here that He is ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων the primary meaning is that He is the legitimate door of access to the spiritual αἴλη the Fold of the House of Israel, the door by which a true shepherd must enter. In v. 9 the thought is rather that He is the door which must be used by the sheep' (J. H. Bernard, *St. John [I.C.C.]*, ii. 352).

A RECENT statement by Dr. William M. Miller of the American Presbyterian Mission in Persia (Irān) may throw considerable light on this much 'disputed passage'. His experience though even more full of commentary than that of the late Dr. Van Ess (told in his *Meet the Arab*, 74),¹ does not stand alone; for different types of αἴλη must be taken into account—whether a *murāh* ('a roofed stone hovel') or a *mughārah* (a cave at ground level as in the Fields of the Shepherds, in which case it would be out of the question for any 'thief or robber' to 'climb up some other way') or a *hazīrah* (constructed of rough stones with a species of 'hedge' [*siyāj*] on the top).² Perhaps our Lord had in mind the last-named, more so if the conversation took place in the vicinity of the sheep gate, close to which lambs for sacrifice would have been penned in temporary structures of this nature.

¹ The experience of Dr. John Van Ess in his own words is: 'One day towards sunset I rode up to a large enclosure made of mud walls, perhaps six feet high, on the top of which thorns had been placed. In front was a doorway but no door, and inside were scores of sheep. So I asked the shepherd standing there, what was the use of all the precautions of walls and thorns, since there was no door. "Oh", he said, "I sleep in the doorway. I am the door." "Ya Abdur Rahmān", he shouted, "open up a stall for the guest and his horse". And to him and for me the porter opened'. (This has already been quoted from *Meet the Arab*, 74 in *Jesus of Palestine*, 299.)

² See the chapter entitled 'The Shepherd' in Rihbani's *The Syrian Christ*, 295 ff. Cf. Thomson, *The Land and The Book*, 201-203.

Dr. Miller says:

'Many years ago I was travelling by donkey from Nishapur, the city of the poet Omar Khayyam, in eastern Iran to Sabsevar a three days journey to the west. We stopped in a tiny village of mud huts for the night, and when we arose next morning the dry dusty land was covered with a mantle of beautiful white snow.

'As the donkey driver stated firmly that it was impossible for his animals to move while the snow was so deep, there was nothing to do but wait till the snow melted a bit. So all that day we remained in the village.

'In the afternoon I set out to see the sights about the village. Not far away I came to a mound of earth piled up in a large circle, like a crude rampart, and on the top of the mound all around the circle was a heap of dry thorns. As I stood wondering what this might be one of the villagers approached me. "Salaam", I said, "please tell me what this enclosure is for".

"O, that is for the sheep", he replied. "They are brought in here for the night for safety."

"Good", I said, "but why have the dry thorns been piled on top of the wall?"

"That", he replied, "is a protection against wolves. If a wolf tries to break in and attack the sheep, he will knock against the thorns, and they will make a noise, and the shepherd will wake up, and drive off the wolf."

"That is fine", I said, "but why does the wolf try to climb over the wall? Here is the entrance to the enclosure, it is open. There is no door to keep out the wolf; he could easily enter here."

"O no", said my guide, "you do not understand. That is where the shepherd sleeps, the shepherd is the door."

'And then I understood something that had often puzzled me. It became clear to me why Jesus had in John 10 called Himself first the Door and then immediately afterwards the Shepherd. Since He is the Shepherd He is also the Door.'³

³ The quotation is verbatim from the account by Dr. Miller written in Teheran, January 20, 1960, at the request of the Anglican Bishop in Persia (the Rt. Rev. W. J. Thompson), who had already heard the story from Dr. Miller some time ago. It has been reproduced here with the full concurrence of Dr. Miller through a letter from the Bishop, March 3, 1960. It has not been published previously.

This (not isolated experience) may well answer the criticism that there is a 'harsh change' from the simile of the shepherd to that of the door or vice versa. The Oriental shepherd does lie in the 'narrow entrance'. There hardly seems need for any arbitrary tampering with the text to substitute 'shepherd' for 'door' in the wake of the Sahidic.¹ Coupled with Dr. Van Ess's similar observation there is also an answer to the comment that our Lord had two different ideas in mind as between the statements in the two verses. He is the 'door of the sheep', not the gate of the fold, a picture which He emphasized in the reiteration of 'the door' and the following explanation of what it means to the sheep when He is the Door. He is there all the time by night to guard; by day ready to lead out to the green pastures and beside the still waters.

As interesting as the experiences of the two missionaries is the fact that they took place, respectively in neighbouring 'Irāq and Irān, the two countries of the Near East where door or *bāb* has had theological connotations both in early Islamic and in comparatively modern times. In *The Expositor's Greek Testament* Marcus Dods has a bracketed sentence in his comment on the words 'I am the door of the sheep'. He wrote, 'I and no other am the door of the sheep (cf. the Persian reformer who proclaimed himself the *Bāb*, the gate of life)'.² In Arabic *bāb* means either door or gate (*θύρα* or *πύλη*), while it has developed or extended significances, the most important being a 'chapter' in a book, when the reader is introduced to a new subject; and a distinct 'class' as when someone is described as *farīd fi bābihi* ('alone in his class', i.e., 'unique').³ In the Qur'ān the allusions are to 'gates' or 'doors'. But *bāb* seems to have been an early loan word, though opinions have differed as to its origin. While some have sought an origin in Aramaic because common in 'Rabbinic writings', Jeffery inclines to the suggestion that it was 'an early borrowing from Mesopotamia and may have come directly into Arabic. It occurs commonly in the old poetry, which confirms the theory of early borrowing and it is noteworthy that from some Mesopotamian source it passed into Middle Persian'.⁴ There does seem ground for the note by Marcus Dods; and that, whether or not our Lord's use of *θύρα* in this chapter has any relationship with later uses of the word *bāb* by groups of religious people on the fringes of

Islam, the last being the virtual founder of Babism or Bahaism, the comment of Bishop Westcott is germane that in *v. 7* the allusion is to the 'door in respect of society' and in *v. 9* to the 'office'.⁵ Edersheim suggested that those who were 'before' Him pretended to be the door.⁶ This emphasizes the dignity of the position.

It is perhaps here that the Islamic use of the term lends weight. The great division in the Islamic world is that between the Sunnis, who are far the larger group, and the Shiis, who are mostly confined to 'Irāq and Irān. The latter were early on frustrated in their desire for a Khalifa descended from the Prophet, through the assassination of 'Ali (cousin and son-in-law of the Prophet) in A.D. 661, and the death in battle twenty years later of his son, Husain. Thus in the words of Grunebaum, 'what appeared a temporal issue—the quest for the rightful holder of the imamate, the leadership of the community—came to be the centre of their theology. They revived the old motif of the epiphany of the divine in man and taught that the *Imām*, of necessity a descendant of 'Ali . . . as the carrier of a particle of divine light or substance, was the indispensable guide to eternal bliss.'⁷ There followed for the Shiites a series of *Imāms*, the twelfth (and last) of whom disappeared about 260 A.H. while for some seventy years there were men who acted as intermediaries between him and his people. These men were called *wakīl* or *wakīl*, but also *bābs* or doors to the knowledge of the *Imām*. 'A thousand years later 'Ali Muhammad in Shiraz made the claim that he was the *Bāb*, the Door to the knowledge of the *Imām* who was soon to appear.'⁸ It was as the *Bāb* that he became famous so that his followers were known as *Bābis*. His immediate successors were Bahā 'Allah and Abdul Bahā' (*bahā* means 'glory' or 'splendour') their 'sect' being later called Bahais. The whole idea, however, of the *Bāb* (who suffered terribly in the person of 'Ali Muhammad in Shiraz) is read back into early Islamic tradition. The 'seveners' (followers of the seventh *Imām* after 'Ali) have a tradition with regard to him that the Prophet said with respect to himself and 'Ali ibn Abi Tālib, 'I am the City of Knowledge and Ali is the Door' (*Bāb*). There does seem to be the same circle of ideas in Johannine and Shiite thinking, the most significant being the personalization of the Door or

¹ See Moffat's footnote to his reading the Sahidic 'shepherd' in *v. 7*. He brackets *v. 9*.

² *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, i. 789.

³ *Muḥit al Muḥit*, i. 141.

⁴ *Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'ān*, 74.

⁵ *The Gospel of St. John*, 152 f.

⁶ *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 190.

⁷ *Islam*, 10.

⁸ From a statement by the Bishop in Persia.

the *Bāb*.¹ Taking His metaphor from among the simplest yet most responsible callings in the Near

¹ Apparently one of the first Persians to accept Islam during the lifetime of Muhammad was Salman al Farisi, possibly a Christian previously. He became a member of the curious 'Trinity' of the Nusairiyya sect (around Lake Huleh) the other two being Muham-

East, a feature that has withstood the ravages of time, the Lord remains the Guide to society, the Door to the City of God. 'Thou hast *opened* the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers.'

mad and 'Ali, but Salman is known in this connexion as the *Bab*. Perhaps the best known modern use has been 'The Sublime Porte'.

Significant Modern Writers

Franz Kafka

BY PROFESSOR W. B. J. MARTIN, D.D., PERKINS SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY, DALLAS, TEXAS

THE English-speaking world owes its introduction to the novels of Franz Kafka—*The Trial*, *The Castle*, *Amerika*—and his collections of short stories—*The Great Wall of China* and *The Penal Colony*—to the interest and industry of the Scottish poet and man-of-letters, Edwin Muir. I once asked Dr. Muir about this enterprise, and he told me that when he and his wife Willa were translating Kafka's works in Prague, they were both haunted night after night by horrifying dreams, and I don't wonder at it.

One way of regarding the novels of Kafka is to see them as dreams, even nightmares, rendered with utter and exact matter-of-factness. This is what gives them their power: they record with strict logic what is essentially illogical, they render obscurity with brilliant clarity. A dramatic critic said when *The Trial* was dramatized in Paris: 'The sanity of this play's insanity is terrifying'. It is a mistake to think of Kafka's stories as 'symbolic', says Hillis Miller, as if their mysterious images, descriptions and actions stood for something other than themselves. 'They are not symbolic but perfectly literal descriptions of his inner life.' There are no purple passages in Kafka: the events he records are dreamlike, fantastic, irrational, but they are reported with such scrupulous attention to detail, such meticulous observation of mundane things like tables and chairs, and office desks, and stairways and passages, that, as Eric Heller has put it, 'the grey world is luminous with fire'.

Franz Kafka was born in Prague in 1883, of middle-class Jewish parents. He died in 1924, at the age of forty-one. In between these dates there is little to report, all the drama of Kafka's short life took place within. He lived most of his life in the city of Prague, except for a short spell in Berlin during World War One, when the

cold and hunger he experienced undoubtedly hastened his end by tuberculosis. He received the conventional, middle-class, Czechoslovakian education, but was slow about deciding on his life's work. He finally adopted the Law as his profession, since the Law seemed most likely to provide him with a means of livelihood and opportunity to pursue his vocation as a writer. After taking his doctorate in the University of Prague he worked for a while in an insurance office, and then obtained the coveted eight-to-two job in a semi-government department, 'The Workers' Accident Insurance Office', doing most of his writing by night.

So he experienced in his personal life the two worlds rendered so precisely in his novels—the routine, safe world of business, bureaucracy, forms and precedents, and the wild world of creative imagination. But there was a third world that impinged on both, the world of home, a tight repressive bourgeois home, with a fond mother and a harsh, conventional, strong-willed and ambitious father. In a most moving document, the *Letter to My Father*, mingled with love and loathing, gratitude and resentment, Kafka wrote the revealing lines: 'In front of you I lost my self-confidence, and exchanged it for an infinite sense of guilt'. All his life, first in the person of his own father, then in the world of legal business, Kafka felt confronted with the Law, a Law which, with the Apostle Paul, he felt he had no power to satisfy. With his kinsman, Job, he cried out, 'How shall a man be justified before God?'

Perhaps it is not surprising in view of his home life and upbringing, that Kafka's relationships with women were curiously unsatisfying, like that of another great 'K.', the Danish writer, Kierkegaard, with whom he has something in common.

He remained unmarried, but in his last illness was nursed by a young Jewish girl brought up in an orthodox family in Poland. With her he seemed to have found the happiness he never expected to find. He died in a sanatorium near Vienna, devoting the last period of his life to a study of the Hebrew language and scriptures, perhaps endeavouring after many years of wandering to root himself in the soil of his ancestral faith.

W. H. Auden has said of him: 'Had one to name the artist who comes nearest to bearing the same kind of relation to our age that Dante, Shakespeare, and Goethe bore to theirs, Kafka is the first we would think of'. He mapped out for the men of his time the labyrinthine ways of the Waste Land, he made a science of alienation, and did so with such vicarious power that Edwin Muir addresses him in his poem of tribute . . .

And you, dear Franz, sad champion of the drab
And half, would watch the tell-tale shames drift in
(As if they were troves of treasure) . . .
And read on all the leaves of sin
Eternity's secret script, the saving proof.

II.

In this short study I propose to examine only one of the three major novels, *The Trial*. It is somewhat ironical that this work is now available in the Penguin series of paper-backs, since Kafka himself expressly forbade the printing of it and only the disobedient piety of his friend and biographer, Max Brod, rescued it for posterity. When one speculates on the reason for Kafka's request, one is reminded of D. H. Lawrence's lines:

Let me never know what I am or should be
When I have fallen out of your hands, the hands of
the living God.

Like Lawrence, Kafka was probably aware that in all his probing and searching, he had been guilty of self-knowledge, the kind of search 'apart from the living God', which can only result in what the English writer called 'disintegrative knowledge'. But this is precisely one of the great values of his book, since it portrays with faithful realism the plight of man in our time who asks the questions of life outside of the framework of faith, and apart from a meaningful relationship to his Creator and Judge.

The Trial opens with the words: 'Someone must have been telling lies about Joseph K., for without having done anything wrong he was arrested one fine morning'. The hero is chief clerk in a bank, and is referred to throughout the

book by his initial, as though he were deficient in personality, in family background and status, as indeed he proves to be—the typical, uprooted displaced person. The 'arrest' takes place on the eve of his thirty-first birthday. Albert Camus has pointed out in the *Myth of Sisyphus* that the age of thirty is a crucial period in a man's life, when it becomes impossible to ignore the threat of time or to fool himself about his achievements, and it is clear that Kafka intends this startling event to stand for the middle point in human life, an abrupt jolt into crisis. But at no point in the story is K. told the nature of his crime, nor does he ever come face to face with the judge, nor does his arrest ever take him right out of the familiar workaday world, to which now, however, he has a new and bizarre relationship.

At first K. tries to deal with the situation along familiar lines: he supposes it must be a practical joke played upon him by his office friends. Then he tries another tack: it is all a mistake, a blunder committed at headquarters (wherever that is!). He asks the two men sent to apprehend him for their credentials, but they only laugh; he tries to produce his own, but they have mysteriously disappeared. Pulling himself together, he thinks, 'It will be all right if I can see someone in authority, not these ignorant menials'. But the situation gets worse instead of better. *The more rational he strives to be, the more irrational the situation becomes.* As the case proceeds, he begins to brood over his past, to analyse his relationships with other people, to analyse himself lest some secret flaw, some unconscious betrayal has landed him in this plight. 'To ask questions is surely the main thing', he says, but what questions? That in itself now becomes a problem. Finally, after many disconcerting, nightmare experiences, during which clichés he has used a hundred times fall to pieces on his lips, he is carried off, stabbed to the heart by his warder, crying 'Like a dog'.

John Middleton Murry once wrote: 'A truly great novel is a tale to the simple, a parable to the wise, and a direct revelation of reality to the man who has made it a part of his being'.

1. On one level, *The Trial* is a tale, almost a satire on the growingly familiar world of bureaucracy, with its tortuous ramifications and frustrations, a sort of Czechoslovakian *Little Dorrit*, complete with its Circumlocution Office and its maddening delays and buck-passing. Kafka's experience in the Workers' Accident Insurance Office in Prague undoubtedly provided him with rich material here. This world is one in which paper has ousted people, and statistics are more important than souls, a world where the Little Man's life is ruled by powers known only by name, never in face-to-face contact.

2. But the tale is certainly not for the simple. It only begins to cohere when it is regarded as a parable of the human situation. It declares that man lives on two levels, in two worlds, which have the strange power of mocking and mystifying one another. So Joseph K. suddenly finds the safe, substantial framework of his daily life, the world of the bank in which he was at home, capable and confident, becoming unreal and hostile. When he is transported to the other world, the world of the Court, his mind, which was such a reliable instrument in dealing with finance, accounts, industrial problems, only flounders when it has to deal with the problems presented by the Law Court; not only does he fail to find the answers, he is unable even to understand the questions or to frame questions that will make sense. 'Somebody had been telling lies about Joseph K.' But were they lies after all? Gradually, Joseph ceases to ponder the question of guilt and innocence; now the question becomes, 'Guilty or innocent, how do I satisfy the Law?' On this level the book might almost be read as a commentary on the doctrine of Justification by Faith. It deals with precisely the same problem that haunted the Apostle Paul, but it only poses the problem in a specially modern manner, it does not come up with a solution. Nevertheless, to a generation which finds the doctrine incomprehensible, Kafka's vivid and agonized delineation of the problem is itself of great service. Depth psychology and existential philosophy have both provided us with clues to investigate the phenomenon of innocent-guilt that Kafka here presents. As he himself wrote in his *Diaries*, 'Sometimes I feel I understand the Fall of Man better than anyone', and again, 'The state in which we find ourselves is sinful, quite independent of guilt'. It is with this problem, now better understood than when Kafka wrote, that his books deal, and since it is remorselessly explored, his books help us to come to a fuller understanding of ourselves and our plight.

3. To take up Middleton Murry's classification once more, *The Trial* can be read on the third level as 'a direct revelation of reality to the man who has made it a part of his being'. The writings of Kafka everywhere show evidence that they were 'a part of his being'. He himself took to writing as a way of salvation. 'My writing', he wrote 'is a form of prayer'; it was his attempt to lift the curse through art, to externalize the nightmare of alienation and thus to win some measure of control over it.

The section of the novel in which Kafka comes closest to a religious solution is that entitled 'In the Cathedral'. I feel sorry for any preacher who is not acquainted with this tremendously moving,

bitterly enigmatic, chapter. Joseph K. finds himself in the cathedral, having been sent there by the Bank to meet a client who never appears. As he is on the point of leaving, a strong voice calls his name from the pulpit of the darkened building, and a young priest proceeds to offer him advice on his plight. Among other things he says that K. is depending too much on outside help, the wrong kind of help, whereupon K. turns away in a huff, but is recalled by an agonized shriek. The priest cries out, 'Can't you see one step before you!', as if addressing a man walking to his doom. So K., startled and impressed, begs the priest to come down from the pulpit to give him personal advice. He replies (and every preacher will sympathize): 'I had to speak to you first from a distance. Otherwise I am too easily influenced and tend to forget my duty.'

When they are both seated, the priest embarks on a long and very detailed parable, one of the greatest parables in modern literature and worthy to be compared with the parables of that other 'single one', Kierkegaard. The parable concerns a man from the country who seeks admission to the Law. Before the Law stands a door-keeper on guard, who keeps him there for days, months, years, until finally the man, aged and frail, dies on the radiant threshold. Before he dies, he asks the door-keeper how it is that through all the years of waiting he has seen no other applicant for admission, whereupon the doorman replies: 'No one but you could gain admittance through this door, since the door was intended only for you. I am now going to shut it.'

K.'s immediate reaction is to analyse the parable, but every attempt he makes is dismissed by the priest, who tells him that he is like so many commentators on Scripture, who advance theories but refuse to confront the facts. He compares K. to the man in the parable who spent his life examining theories and was too exhausted and wasted to make direct contact with reality. In some ways this was Kafka's own story. He spent his short life in a perhaps over-intellectualized quest, seeking salvation through writing, and found only at the end that Justification is by grace through faith. His place in this series of Significant Modern Writers reminds us how hard it is for modern man, eroded by scepticism and individualism, to accept grace, since he knows in his ordinary workaday world only relationships of merit and strife and self-justification. When, near death in the sanatorium, he ceased to earn salvation and accepted the love of the young Jewish girl Dora, he, the lonely adventurer, came near to realizing with his great kinsman Martin Buber: 'only as bondsmen can we enter into the freedom of the children of God'.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Slow . . . School

By H. F. MATHEWS, M.A., PH.D., KIDDERMINSTER

' . . . the glorious liberty of the children of God '.—
Ro 8²¹.

You have noticed the change, I expect. For many years the sign near your school warning motorists that they needed to drive with extra care was a flaming torch. But, unless yours is one of the very few which have not been changed lately, the sign is now—well, what is it? Two youngsters scurrying along with satchels flying. None of old Bill Shakespeare's 'whining schoolboy' stuff, 'creeping like snail unwillingly to school'. Why, they look as though they really like the place!

That flaming torch business *was* a bit starchy, wasn't it? It was a very noble reminder that the torch of learning has been passed to us by those who came before, and that we have a duty to pass it to those who come after. But it made it all a bit too solemn. Learning to live is a thrilling, adventurous, personal business. It isn't something we take over wholesale from other people.

We don't sit stock still in desks nowadays, absorbing facts like a lot of porous sponges. We find out about things by our projects, our topic-lessons, our craft activities, our library periods, our Bible-searches. We don't merely write formal exercises in lined books. We produce our diaries, our guide books, our class newspapers, our charts and friezes. Teachers have discovered that we can learn more when we are given our liberty to learn. And all that is reflected in the new sign we have come to adopt.

Jesus, who was the perfect Teacher, knew all this two thousand years ago. The Pharisees were content to say that religion was something which had been handed down and could not be changed. The many meticulous laws had to be obeyed to the letter, and that made religion into a hard, joyless thing. (Sadly enough, there are still some modern Pharisees who think they ought to make lists of the things we must *not* do, rather than underline the glad things we ought to do for others.) But from Jesus we learned of a Father-God who took the great risk of giving us our freedom. We could become sons or enemies, disciples or deserters. The rich young ruler

wanted a set of new rules. Jesus showed him that he had all the rules: what he needed was to learn how to break free from something which fettered him—in his case, it was money; and 'he went away sorrowful'.

God gave us freedom because that was the only way He could have us as sons. It was the same sort of risk that we take in school. The new, freer methods of learning make it possible for the slacker to 'get away with it'; but they open a new wonder-world to the wise person who will take the opportunity they provide. And the new call of Jesus to venture all with Him has opened a living way more exciting than the greatest of the Old Testament seers glimpsed. But it means that we have to follow, to seek, to question, to endure.

Do you know about George Washington Carver? He was a brilliant scientist. From the Institute at Tuskegee in Alabama where he became Professor, news went out of the thousands of experiments on cotton and plants, which brought new prosperity to farmers for miles around. He used to say: 'I am God's servant, His agent, the instrument through which He speaks. Without God to draw aside the curtain, I would be helpless.' He had spent his life gloriously finding out what God was saying to men.

But Carver's father had been a slave, and he himself had to buy his first schooling by taking in washing. He was so eager to learn that he risked everything. And when he became famous and business firms wanted to buy his brains, he refused to sell himself. He believed that when men learned to claim what God had left for them in the world, poverty would be conquered and happiness would abound. It was his glad task to show others how to use God's good gifts.

He was one of God's glorious freemen, whose names are legion.

White Cottage

By RITA SNOWDEN, AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND

Nobody in all London could remember such a fuss—and all about an old apple-woman! She was a cunning old apple-woman. The place she had picked for her stall was in London's Hyde Park. At first nobody took much notice of her—the little piece of grass on which she set up was so small.

But soon, the old apple woman—Ann Hicks—had an idea. And whenever an idea danced into her old brain, she took pen and paper and wrote a letter. Then she folded it and sent it off to somebody important—the Commissioner of Woods and Forests, who took care of Hyde Park. ‘People who don’t want to buy my apples, might buy something else’, said she cleverly. ‘Is it all right for me to sell them toothsome toffees and buns?’ ‘Certainly’, came the reply.

But it wasn’t long before the cunning old apple-woman had another idea—and, of course, wrote another letter. ‘It’s back-aching work moving all my goods in and out: I would like to be able to lock them up at night.’ ‘Of course, Mrs. Hicks’, came the reply. ‘It must be hard work, as you say.’

So the cunning old apple-woman had the little lock-up built, with a good sturdy key.

But it wasn’t long before she had another idea. ‘The people who buy my buns’, she wrote this time, ‘would like to buy drinks of ginger-beer. They get so thirsty. Is that all right?’ ‘Why, to be sure’, came the reply, ‘they must get thirsty.’

But that was not the end of it. The ginger-beer bottles stood so tall on the shelf, they were awkward. ‘I’d like to raise the roof of my little lock-up’, wrote the old apple-woman. ‘By all means’, came the reply. And while the workmen were at it, she had it raised nearly as high as herself—five feet!

Nor was that the end of the ideas that danced into her lively old mind. ‘The roof isn’t very waterproof’, she wrote, ‘the rain comes in, and spoils my goods when there’s a storm. Can I put up a few tiles?’ The reply came. But when the workmen arrived she said to them: ‘A roof is good, but why not a nice little chimney as well—and while you are here with your tools, why not a nice little window?’

So the cunning ideas of old Ann Hicks took shape. For ‘here a little, and there a little’, the cunning old apple-woman had set herself up in a comfortable little house, where no house should be at all. And there, cheekily defying all who came, it stood for many a day, at the eastern end of the Serpentine, in Hyde Park.

Then one day, news went out that there was to be a Great Exhibition—and it was to be in Hyde Park. And a Committee of clever people and great set out to see where was the best place in the Park to put it. Among them was the Commissioner of Woods and Forests! To their amazement, there before them stood a little house—‘White Cottage’—where no cottage should be at all, in the public park, rent free. At once, they told old Ann Hicks she had no right to be

there—and that if she didn’t move there’d be trouble. She protested that she had asked permission; but she had worded her letters so carefully, so cunningly, of course, that no one had any idea what she was up to. And always when she had been granted permission, she had taken a little more.

Some said she should be allowed to stay, to sell apples and toffees and bottles of ginger-beer in the Park. But most said she had no business there at all. The matter got into the London newspapers. In the end, it was taken to Parliament to be settled. Of course, it was no good—old Ann Hicks had to move out of the Park. But she fought for her cunning ideas to the very last apple.

People were amazed: how, they asked, had such a thing happened? But it was plain enough—‘here a little, and there a little’ (Is 28¹⁰).

In this amazing world most wrong things are like that—they don’t appear all at once. And those of us who love fair things and honest, have to watch out, and see that they are stopped, before they grow into something settled.

The Christian Year

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

In Light Inaccessible

BY THE REVEREND ELAM DAVIES, M.A., D.D.,
BETHLEHEM, PENNSYLVANIA

‘And he was transfigured before them He [Peter] was still speaking, when lo, a bright cloud overshadowed them, and a voice from the cloud said, This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased. When the disciples heard this, they fell on their faces, and were filled with awe. But Jesus came and touched them, saying, Rise, and have no fear.’—Mt 17^{2, 5-7} (R.S.V.).

The famous philosopher, A. N. Whitehead, once asked the question ‘How can the Old Testament saying that the fear of God is the beginning of wisdom be reconciled with the New Testament saying that God is Love?’ To this inquiry, Martin Buber, the renowned Jewish theologian and philosopher replied, ‘He who begins with the love of God without having previously experienced the fear of God, loves an idol which he himself has made, a god whom it is easy enough to love!’

Of course, the writers of the Old Testament did not mean by the ‘fear of God’ what is often crudely associated with that phrase. Certainly not the terror of the tortured mind. Not even the

poetic conviction of a Milton, who on arriving at the age of twenty-three decides

All is, if I have grace to use it so,
As ever in my great Task-Master's eye.

The 'fear' they speak of is both subtler and deeper, but before we try to define it let us seek to illustrate it.

We all know about the story of the Transfiguration told in the first three Gospels. It was a strange event. None of the accounts of it quite tally, but it is not surprising when you think about what took place. Peter, James and John accompanied Jesus to a lonely spot on a mountain top. The Master was going there to pray, and we would not be surprised to hear that it was His intention that the disciples should share in this time of devotion. While He prayed something exceedingly startling happened. It is hard for us to tell whether the three disciples together had a unique vision or what. The best we can do is to quote the words of the New Testament itself, 'And he was transfigured before them, and his face shone like the sun, and his garments became *white as light*'.

What do people do when they are surprised by the mysterious? From my own observation they are reduced to complete silence, or they begin to talk wildly. Peter, never a silent man, found himself talking. When he saw Moses and Elijah conversing with Jesus he muttered something about making 'three tents' but before the sound of his words could die away, 'A bright cloud overshadowed them and a voice out of the cloud . . .' This was the final touch as far as these three very mortal men were concerned. 'They fell on their faces, and were filled with awe.' There they remained until Jesus touched them. 'Rise', He said, 'and have *no fear*!' Do you see the point? Fear, yes, but the kind we would call awe—wonder and amazement in the face of the Infinite!

Side by side with this, put another story, this time a contemporary one, *The Big Show* told by Pierre Clostermann. This young fighter-pilot has described the wonder of flying at dawn. 'I climbed through the darkness . . . Suddenly without any transition, I plunged like a diver into full golden light. The wings of my Spitfire turned crimson. I was so dazzled that I had to lower my smoked glasses over my eyes . . . the sun emerged like a molten ingot from the inert leaden mass of the North Sea . . . Moments such as these compensate for many a sacrifice, many a danger.'

'Moments such as these . . .' What kind? Moments when fear of danger or of anything else is eclipsed by a humbling awareness of Beauty, Majesty, Mystery. 'The disciples fell on their

faces', Matthew recalls. 'I was so dazzled that I had to lower my smoked glasses', says Pierre Clostermann. Light can overwhelm as well as comfort. It can hide as well as reveal.

Walter Chalmers Smith very clearly saw this 'hiding quality' of light when he wrote:

Immortal, invisible, God only wise,
In light inaccessible, hid from our eyes,

Great Father of Glory, pure Father of Light,
Thine angels adore Thee, all veiling their sight;
All praise we would render; O help us to see
'Tis only *the splendour of light hideth Thee*.

The clarion call of the Christian gospel is 'God is Love'. But it is doubtful whether we can really come to terms with its meaning until we are willing at the same time to bow before the God who is Light. A God who is not a mystery is a cheap God, an idol of our own making. When you have a cheap God, you have cheap love, and 'cheap love' is sentiment.

Yet if we try to peer into the mystery of God we shall be overwhelmed. Does not the question naturally arise, then—How should we relate ourselves to this God who is marvellous Light? We must learn the kind of 'fear' which issues in reverence and awe, and this must be seen in the way we think, the way we worship, and the way we act.

1. *The reverence of the mind is its willingness to 'know in part'*. In the famous passage from his letter to the Church at Corinth, which has become known as the 'Hymn of Love' the Apostle Paul points out how partial our knowledge of God is.

At best our knowledge amounts to no more than 'the baffling reflections in a mirror' and if we try to look away from the reflections into the light which causes them, we shall be blinded by further impenetrable mystery. The beginning of wisdom is to accept God's limitation on what can be known about Him. This should not hold us back from the honest use of the power of a searching mind, but it should deliver us from the insolence of so many of our smaller 'why's' and the frequent petulance of our 'I don't understand!'

Dr. H. H. Farmer has said that 'Christianity whilst it claims to give knowledge always asks for a certain humble agnosticism in a man's thought about God, and in his attitude towards Him'.

It means that without pretence, without feigning pious ignorance, we are ready to confess that there is so much about God that we can only guess at, indeed, much which will forever completely baffle us. In Jesus Christ the 'Light of

the world', He has made Himself known, but this light hides as well as reveals.

2. *The reverence of the spirit is its willingness to bow humbly in worship.* It is symbolized by the disciples prostrate before the Transfigured Christ. Awe, wonder, love and praise have always marked out the worshipping spirit. It is sustained by the awareness that the more we 'see' the less we truly know.

The sceptic has listened to many a prayer, and called it gibberish; the worldly-wise has heard many a testimony and called it nonsense. What they have failed to understand is that a person who has suddenly been confronted by the majesty of God's glory has never been able, at that moment, to be particularly eloquent.

Speaking last year before a hushed and spell-bound Congress, Carl Sandburg the poet had this to say about Lincoln, his towering hero: 'Millions there are who take him as a personal treasure. He had something they would like to see spread everywhere over the world. Democracy? We can't find words to say exactly what it is, but he had it. He had the idea. It's there in the lights and shadows of his personality, a *mystery that can be lived* but never spoken in words.'

Many millions more have found in Another a far greater personal treasure. He it is who had what men and women in every generation have sought—the Light of the Divine. In every quality of His personality it was to be seen. When people came to know Christ, they came to know God, but afterwards they gave up trying to explain Jesus, and found in the end that they had to worship before the mystery that was lived, but never could be spoken in words.

3. *The reverence of the will is its readiness to obey.* The truly religious man in his profoundest spiritual mood has always understood what George Croly meant when he wrote:

I ask no dream, no prophet ecstasies,
No sudden rending of the veil of clay,
No angel visitant, no opening skies,
But take the dimness of my soul away.

But this is not the longing of the mystically starved soul. It is the cry of a heart wanting to learn the secret of obedience.

'Teach me to love Thee', cries this man, 'as
Thine angels love,
One holy passion filling all my frame. . . .'

The heart of true religion is not the intellectual knowledge of God or the mystical awareness of His presence, but obedience to His will. Those who know that 'in him there is no darkness at all' are those who seek to 'walk in the light'. The final test of true reverence is moral obedience.

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Lord's Prayer

BY PROFESSOR A. M. HUNTER, PH.D., D.PHIL., D.D.,
MASTER OF CHRIST'S COLLEGE, ABERDEEN

'Pray then like this.'—Mt 6⁹ (R.S.V.).

In a letter written shortly before he died, Thomas Carlyle tells how he whiled away a sleepless night by trying to think out the meaning of the Lord's Prayer, only to find himself being carried out of his spiritual depth and swept away into the ultimate mysteries. If that happened to Carlyle, no doubt it may happen to us too; but isn't it worth while to spend at least one sermon-time making the same attempt?

The plan of the prayer is very simple. At the beginning, an Invocation; at the end, a Doxology; and in between, six petitions. Three of them are for the greater glory of God, and three are for our human needs.

Look first at the Invocation—'Our Father who art in heaven'.

The important word here is 'Father'. For any religion the supreme question is, What is God like? And for Christians there is only one right answer, Christ's answer: God is our Heavenly Father. Not a principle, not a force, but a Person; and not any kind of person, but a Father. It was Jesus' way to say to His disciples: 'Think of the very best human father you can imagine—God is all that, and far more'. Great beyond all our comprehending, holy beyond all our conceiving, but a Father—a Father who cares for His children, a Father who is sad when they go astray, and glad when they come home: the Father to whom His own life was one long and loving obedience, and to whom He committed His spirit on the Cross. This is the God we invoke as 'our Father'. Yes, mark the pronoun 'our'. When we say it, we join ourselves with the whole family of God in the wide earth.

1. Now turn to the first petition—'Hallowed be thy name'.

'What's in a name?' we say, as though it were simply a label devised for the postman's convenience. But the Bible takes names seriously. In the Bible the name of a person stands for his nature as revealed. So God's name is His nature, or character, as He has revealed it to us. Now God has made His character known in many ways—in the beauty of His created world, in His mighty acts in history, above all, in His Son, Jesus Christ. How then is His name to be 'hallowed'—kept holy, revered? We hallow God's name in our minds, by thinking only

worthy thoughts of Him; in our speech, by keeping only pure and true words, on our lips; and in our deeds, by doing only what He would have His children do.

2. The second petition reads: 'Thy kingdom come'.

Please don't picture God's Kingdom as a politicians' paradise or some kind of super Welfare State under Divine patronage. The Kingdom of God signifies God's 'Kingly Rule'. A dynamic, not a static idea! It means God reigning, God breaking decisively into history to visit and redeem His people. More than that, it is the very heart of the gospel that God's reign really and finally began when He sent His Son, by His life and death, to reconcile the world to Himself. This, however, was only a beginning; and from this unremarkable beginning, Jesus said in the Parable of the Mustard Seed, the Kingdom was destined to grow to unimaginable endings. The Kingdom then has been inaugurated, but it has not yet been consummated.

So when we pray 'Thy kingdom come', we pray God to *complete* His great purpose of salvation which He took in hand when He sent His Son.

When that Kingdom fully comes, evil will be abolished for ever, and all the promises of the Beatitudes will come true. Then the mourners will be comforted, the pure in heart will see God, and His children will be finally at home in their Heavenly Father's house.

3. Now turn to the third petition—'Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven'.

Only God can consummate His reign. Does this mean that man can sit back and do nothing? No, this petition reminds us that *we* have our part to play. But see what we have done with it! We have turned the words 'Thy will be done' into a tombstone *cliché*, when Jesus meant them as a summons to God's servants to be up and doing—'Thy will be done—and done by me!'

What is God's will? What pleases God. And what this is, Christ has told us. It is health, not disease; service, not selfishness; giving, not grabbing; loving, not hating; the Golden Rule, not the rule of the jungle. In God's heaven it is always so; and here we pray that earth may become in this like heaven.

So the first half of the prayer ends. Having asked for the big things, we are now free to pray for our own needs, and in particular, for provision, for pardon and for protection.

4. 'Give us this day our daily bread.' This, the fourth petition, teaches our dependence on God. Sometimes we say that a man has 'independent means'. But nobody really has. We can't command the harvest; God gives it. And all the tractors in the world would be so much

useless metal, if God didn't quicken life within the seed. No, our daily bread comes not from the farmer, not from the miller, not from the baker, but from God. And this our dependence on Him we acknowledge whenever we say 'Grace' before meat.

But notice two things. First, Jesus authorizes us to ask God only for what we need. It is a prayer for daily bread, and not for daily cake! Second, this petition is not an invitation to idleness. It does not rule out the human effort needed to make God's gift our own. As somebody has remarked, 'God feeds the sparrows, but He doesn't put the crumbs into their mouths'.

5. The fifth petition says: 'And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors'.

From bread to sin; for there is another hunger, the hunger of the soul for forgiveness of all the sins that separate us from God. We are all sinners; we sin every day; and every day we need to ask God's pardon.

Notice that Christ calls sins 'debts'. The word stands for all that we should do towards God and our fellow-men—all that we should do and don't. So every day we must say we are sorry and ask God's forgiveness.

But mark the condition attached: 'as we forgive our debtors'. The two forgivenesses go together. We needn't pray for forgiveness if we are not ready to bestow it. An unforgiving spirit slams the door in the face of God's forgiveness. When General Oglethorpe said to John Wesley, 'I never forgive', Wesley replied, 'Then I hope, sir, you never sin'. For 'unforgiving, unforgiven' is a law of the spiritual world over which our Father rules.

6. The last petition says: 'And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil'.

It is a cry for protection. But watch the word 'temptation'. Here it does not signify enticement to do evil; for God never does that. It means 'trial' or 'testing'. Now God does permit us to be tested; and without such trials we would never develop any moral muscle or backbone. Yet every trial involves the risk that you and I may succumb to the downward pull of evil. Therefore, in this petition we pray: 'Heavenly Father, so far as it is possible, spare us moral adventures; but if they needs must be, help us to come victoriously through them'.

Then, as with a peal of trumpets, the Prayer ends in a Doxology—'For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory for ever'—and we are back where we began in the thought of the majesty and perfection of God.

Well, that is the Lord's Prayer, the Prayer Jesus taught His disciples, the family Prayer, the Prayer that teaches us how to pray. It is so

short and simple that a child can understand enough to pray it. On the other hand, the saint or the sage can never fathom all its depths. Unfathomable? Yes, but how universal also! For it concerns itself with the needs of all men, high and humble, rich and poor, white and yellow and black.

The true Christian will pray it every day; and when he prays it, he should try to pray it with meaning, and with the full force of his heart.

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Divine Companionship

BY THE REVEREND JOHN R. GRAY, V.R.D., B.D.,
TH.M., GLASGOW

'But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods.'—Dn 3¹⁸.

The issue which faced Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego was an essentially simple one—idolatry or death. It is an issue with which men and women have been faced from the very beginning. The Jews were under constant pressure to conform to the religions of the far mightier nations round about them, and were continually threatened with extinction for refusing to do so. The infant Christian Church was barely born before persecution began, and the history of its first years is the story of increasing pressure on its members to acknowledge the Emperor as divine. It was not much that was asked—just a pinch of incense on the Emperor's shrine. Those who conformed were given a clearance certificate, and were safe. But many refused, and were thrown to a cruel death among wild beasts in the arena. So it continued all down through the centuries; now it was a Savonarola in Florence, now an obscure lover of the gospel like Paul Crawar in Scotland; all paid with their lives for their testimony to the sovereignty of God. The same dilemma confronted many who followed Luther and Calvin into the Church of the Reformation. They were faced with martyrdom if they refused to bow the knee to the current idolatry. It was for the Crown Rights of the Redeemer that the Covenanters fought and died. The same issue reappeared at the time of the Disruption of 1843. In the thirties of this century, men and women were subjected to the pressure to conform to a State religion in Japan and Germany, and in our own day poor creatures in Russia and Colombia are being forced to choose between obedience to God and their own safety. This is the classical conflict of all history, the thin

red line which runs through its multi-coloured pattern.

Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego had no doubts about their answer. They were determined that nothing would induce them to conform. Their determination arose from three convictions. Firstly they were sure that God could deliver them from the burning, fiery furnace. Their recollection of how God had delivered His people over and over again, beyond all human calculation, was enough to make them confident that He could do so again if He willed. This, in fact, is what He did for them and for many since. St. Paul was wonderfully preserved through three shipwrecks, a night and a day in the deep, through perils of robbers, through perils by the heathen, through perils in the wilderness till the time of his unloosing came, and he gave his life for a martyr's crown.

The stories of the miraculous escapes of Prophet Peden in the covenanting times are legion. Once when the soldiers were within a stone's throw he prayed 'Lord save us or we are all dead men. Twine them about the hill, Lord, and cast the hap of thy cloak over Old Sandy and thir poor things and save us this one time and we'll keep it in remembrance and tell it to the commendation of thy goodness, pity and compassion.' The chronicler adds: 'The mist came down and hid them where they stood'. During the War, who, that was present, did not feel that the escape from Dunkirk was due to no human power or calculation?

2. Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego were right. God could deliver and has and will. They were equally sure, however, that God might not deliver. Before they made their act of defiance, they had taken that into account as a real possibility. 'But if not, be it known unto thee, O King, that we will not serve thy gods.' This is disinterested religion at its purest.

It was for this that Christ was for ever pleading. He made and makes no promise that it will be 'roses, roses all the way' for those who cast in their lot with Him. Self-denial and a daily cross is all that He offers, and He was forever pleading with His prospective followers first of all to count the cost.

3. But the third conviction they shared was that which made the three heroes so sure that there was no other way for them, save that of obedience to the living God. They were certain that whether God delivered them or not, *He would not desert them*. This was what mattered, and finally all that mattered to them and to the glorious company of the martyrs who have followed them. God was by their side to deliver them, or to stand by them as the lions or the

flames or the rack or the gas chamber did their fearful work. This it was, the companionship of God, that made the stones of the martyr's cell shine like rubies on the eve of his death, and it was this that sent Bonhoeffer to his end with words of compassion on his lips for his destroyers.

It is not likely that we shall be asked to bow down before an idol, nor be made to sacrifice at an Emperor's shrine, nor even to pay homage to the Master Race. Day and daily, however, we are tempted to value something else more than God—profit, power or popularity. Sometimes to refuse to take the easier path will be almost more than we can do, will mean a veritable fiery trial. The kind of courage we need if we are to be faithful always cannot come from a sense of duty nor from a respect for law alone. It can issue only from the knowledge and the love of God. We, who have known God and His love in a human life of peerless goodness and on a cross, are without excuse for apostasy. For we know, of a surety, that Christ will company with us up to the gates of death and beyond them. This is all that we are promised, but it is enough—that we shall not have to face anything alone.

We can be sure that this is so, just because God did not intervene when most He might have been expected to. When Christ was being crucified, the scribes and Pharisees, mocking Him, said 'He saved others; himself he cannot save. If he be the King of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him. He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him.' Part of the reason why God did not deliver Him was just so that we might be sure that, if we are faithful, there will be with us always, as with Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego, One like unto the Son of God.

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Operative Word of the Gospel

By PROFESSOR J. G. MCKENZIE, D.D., EDINBURGH

'The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy: I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.'—Jn 10¹⁰.

'But covet earnestly the best gifts: and yet shew I unto you a more excellent way.'—1 Co 12³¹.

'Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us.'—Ro 8³⁷.

'And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the publicans so?'—Mt 5⁴⁷.

I was very interested in an article I read in the *Literary Times* some time ago. The writer was a member of the Anglican Church but confessed that he did not attend the services as often as he should. When he asked himself why he, a religious man, did not take the opportunity of building up his faith and of strengthening his spiritual life, he found that the so-called 'brighter services' introduced simply bored him. 'What I want', he wrote, 'when I go to Church is something I can get nowhere else, a message the world cannot give nor take away. There should be something in the Christian message and in Christian worship that is unique and for which there is no substitute.'

Is that not something we all feel?

And is it not the same kind of thing we ask for when we look at Christian lives? Should we not see or sense something in the spirit and behaviour of Christian people that we cannot see in those who make no profession yet live 'decent respectable lives, do no one any harm, and do a good turn when they can'?

What is it, then, in our Christian message which the Anglican felt he could get nowhere else? What is it in our Christian lives that ought to differentiate us from the best that Humanism can produce? The application of psychology to questions of successful living is supposed to be running the gospel hard. 'Don't Grow Old: Grow Up' is the title of one; 'Begin to Live', says another. 'This Way to Happiness' is the title of one of the American best sellers. Each one of them promises maturity of living by the application of psychology. Have we something more to offer which all the applications of psychology cannot reproduce? If we have not something more to give, then have we anything at all?

Here in these texts you find the operative word of the gospel—the word 'more'—*More abundant life; a More excellent way; More than the gifts with which you may be endowed; More than conquerors over life; More than others in our Christian thinking and doing.* That is the claim of our faith and our gospel.

Granted there is something more in our faith, what exactly is that more?

1. *I came to give life and to give it more abundantly.* The first thing Christ gives is not a life opposed to our life here; we are not called to enter a different sphere from the life we are living now. He adds a quality to life that nothing else can give.

Let me illustrate. I remember having to call in the doctor when in Nottingham because of a bronchial cold. He examined me—took my reflexes, sounded my chest. Then he gave me a

prescription and said, 'Take a bottle of that, and then go on for a month to Angiers Emulsion'. 'Why Angiers?' I said. 'I can get the same ingredients from a chemist for a shilling less.' 'Oh', he said, 'did you not commence your ministry in a Yorkshire village where there was just one shop; people had to buy their flour, their yeast, their sugar, etc. from that one shop, and had to bake their own bread. Did you never find when you went out to tea that one person's baking was better than another's?' He was right. The ingredients of life are much the same for us all. We have our work, our difficulties, our worries, our responsibilities. We have our loves, our likes, our joys and sorrows. But is there not a quality with which we carry our responsibilities, face our worries, overcome our difficulties that comes from our Christian faith? Is there not a quality in our love, our joys and our sorrows which cannot be explained outside our love for God? That is what we mean by the New Birth—a principle has entered our very being, the principle of a new quality, that gives a new meaning to life, a new value to everything. It is not a life away from the world and its joys, its problems and its pleasures, and enjoyments. It is a quality that sanctifies every joy, spiritualizes our pleasure, transforms the very streets of life into the highway to the City of our God.

So when we come to society He gives more than a blue-print of a new order; something more than a new international organization. *He socializes the individual and internationalizes the nation. He gives the new man to create a new world. The very sign that a man is evangelized is that he becomes socialized.* That is the meaning of St. Paul when he speaks of a *more excellent way*. Bring the very best gifts you have, says Paul, create your finest Welfare State, but I show you something better, something more, without which all these things are in vain. *Follow after love, love which is the overflow of God's Agape.*

There is the source of this new quality God gives to His children, to a society seeking first the Kingdom—a love free from selfish desire, *Agape* that seeks not her own, that never fails.

2. But now look at the third more—*more than conquerors*. It is not merely a life lived to the full; it is a victorious life. There is not one of us but knows something of life's frustrations, its temptations, its conflicts, its fears, its strains and tensions, even death itself and all that it takes from us. How do we react to these? That is the final test of any philosophy or religion.

There is the Stoic creed—Grit your teeth and bear it. There is the modern agnostic defiance whose reaction is:

My head is bloody but unbowed.

I am the master of my fate;

I am the captain of my soul.

There is the Christian scientist who denies evil, the faith healer who denies sickness and who tells us that sickness is an absence of health.

What is it here that our gospel can give that the others cannot come near? 'We are more than conquerors through him that loved us'. *We are more than conquerors not in spite of all these things, but in the midst of them.* The true Christian way of living, the true Christian joy in living, comes to us not in spite of tribulation, disappointment, or even sin, but because of them. In a word our Christian faith gives a resilience to the 'slings and arrows of fortune' that makes us more than conquerors. We have something left over when life and death have done their worst. Nothing can separate us from the love of God—the same love of which Paul speaks. 'The kind of resilience that is the mark of health', wrote a psychologist recently, 'has at its core something that can best be called "faith".' 'This is the victory', writes John, 'that overcometh the world, even our faith.'

Have I given you a glimpse of the richness of our faith and gospel in which we see something for which the Anglican was looking?—a life lived to the full, because it is animated by a love given by the very Spirit of God, a resilience to life's contradictions which is rooted in faith, a meaning to life that transforms the very world for us.

3. Yes, but what of the last text? Christ gives more, will He not expect more? Our message is a challenge as well as a gospel. *What do ye more than others?*

Is there a quality in our living that differentiates us from those around us however decent and respectable? Is there a quality in our love, in our resilience that the world cannot equal? Is there a quality in our devotion to God, in our service to the Church which the world cannot surpass? Here is the true defence of the faith—the manifestation in our lives, in our thought, in our service of that something more which only God in Christ can give.

Christ gives more. Has He not the right to ask for more? Yea, it is in the giving of that more that the joy and peace that the world cannot give nor take away comes to those souls of ours making us more than conquerors, giving us a more abundant life, a more excellent way than imagination can picture.

Entre Nous

Finding Heaven in a Slum

No one can deny that there is something extraordinary in a man to whose funeral fifteen thousand people came. Such a man was Frank Crossley whose story is told in *He Heard from God*, by Miss E. K. Crossley (Salvationist Publishing and Supplies; 6s. 6d. net).

Frank Crossley was a great Manchester industrialist, the owner of the exceedingly lucrative patent for the Crossley gas engine. He was an industrialist and an engineer of the first rank, but his true greatness lay in the closeness of his walk with God and the passion of his heart for the souls of men.

He was a happy soul with the ability to enjoy himself to the full. His daughter, who wrote this book, tells how he used to go long country walks with her. On one of these walks, she says, 'presently I got up and ambled about, returning to find father lying against a grassy bank, looking so radiant that I exclaimed: "Are you so greatly enjoying yourself?" He replied gently, "Oh, no! Not enjoying *myself*: I am enjoying God".'

He was astonishingly generous with his wealth. To the Salvation Army alone he gave £100,000. Once when he was staying in Bowdon his minister, Dr. Mackennal, came to him asking for a donation for a good cause. Frank Crossley gave him a cheque for £100, and then he said an amazing thing: 'Don't be afraid of bleeding me. I am the possessor of a patent. I may, any morning, find that a new invention has been registered which may render mine useless. While I am making money, I ought to give it away.' Ninety-nine people out of a hundred would have regarded that very situation as a reason for saving money while they had it; Crossley regarded it as an imperative to give it away while he had it.

His most amazing undertaking was the Star Mission in Ancoats. He wished to build and to equip a mission. He deliberately searched a large scale map of Manchester to find the poorest and the toughest district, and the district where least was being done for Christ. He found it in Ancoats. 'His friends, when he discussed the matter with them, warned him not to go to such a district, for they themselves never ventured there without a revolver in their pockets. He learned, too, that it was so rough that the police refused to patrol the streets on Saturday afternoon, unless they walked three abreast. The need was there right enough, a den of iniquity for sale, and before

him a God-given opportunity.' So the old Star Music Hall was bought, and in its place the Star Mission rose.

But Frank Crossley was to do something even more extraordinary. He left with his family his beautiful home in Bowdon actually to live on the premises of the Mission in Ancoats. In the time he could spare from business he went visiting there himself. 'When he found physical needs, he could be seen carrying a lotion for some one with sore eyes, a coat for a child, or hot broth for an ailing mother.' It was in this very slum of Ancoats that one evening he and one of his mission workers were walking together, visiting some of the people, when Frank Crossley turned to the worker and said: 'This is heaven!' Frank Crossley found his heaven in bringing Christ and human kindness to the people of a slum.

He was a man of prayer, and prayer meant for him not so much asking as listening. Among his notes was found the prayer: 'I beseech my Lord to show me fully what is His desire, and keep me continually *in the attitude of listening* for His expression of it'. Frank Crossley was always saying: 'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?'

He was a great believer in holiness. It may be that the more orthodox of us could not go the whole way with him in his teaching of, and belief in, personal holiness. Yet Frank Crossley had something when he said: 'It would be strange if God would not make us as good as we wish to be'.

There is one incident from his life which sums it up. He was a Justice of the Peace. As a magistrate he was compelled to take part in the trial of a Salvation Army lassie who was being prosecuted for preaching in the street, and thereby causing an obstruction. In the midst of the trial Frank Crossley left his seat on the bench and went and stood in the dock beside the girl. It was the passion of Frank Crossley's life to stand beside every one in trouble.

His daughter has done well to give us these memories of her father, for the world can never afford not to know the story of a saint.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.